

High dimensional Mean Test for Temporal Dependent Data

Yuchen Hu and Xiaoyi Wang and Long Feng
Shanghai Jiaotong University; Beijing Normal University; Nankai University

December 1, 2025

Abstract

This paper proposes a novel test method for high-dimensional mean testing regard for the temporal dependent data. Comparison to existing methods, we establish the asymptotic normality of the test statistic without relying on restrictive assumptions, such as Gaussian distribution or M-dependence. Importantly, our theoretical framework holds potential for extension to other high-dimensional problems involving temporal dependent data. Additionally, our method offers significantly reduced computational complexity, making it more practical for large-scale applications. Simulation studies further demonstrate the computational advantages and performance improvements of our test.

Keywords: Asymptotic normality; high dimensional data; mean testing; temporal dependent

1 Introduction

High-dimensional dependent data have gained increasing prominence in various disciplines, including finance, biomedical sciences, and geological studies. Such data typically exhibit both temporal dependence and correlations among different components, leading to intricate and multifaceted dependence structures. The complexity frequently renders traditional statistical approaches insufficient for effectively analyzing these data. This growing complexity has spurred the development of statistically valid inference procedures designed to address the challenges posed by high-dimensional dependent data. Among these challenges, the high-dimensional mean test is of particular importance.

In this paper, we focus on testing the mean vector of high-dimensional dependent data. Much of the existing literature has predominantly concentrated on methods developed for independent and identically distributed data, with the challenges posed by dependent data receiving comparatively less attention. Broadly speaking, these approaches can be categorized into five types, for a detailed review, see Huang et al. (2022). The first category includes modifications of the traditional Hotelling’s T^2 test, as explored by Chen et al. (2011); Li et al. (2020) and others. Since the inversion of the covariance matrix becomes increasingly challenging in high-dimensional settings, alternative strategies have been developed. For example, Bai and Saranadasa (1996) and Chen and Qin (2010) examined the L_2 norm to measure the difference between mean vectors, leveraging largedimensional random matrix theory and U-statistic theory, respectively. Numerous other tests based on the L_2 norm have been proposed, including those by Chen et al. (2019); Feng et al. (2016); Gregory et al. (2015); Li et al. (2016); Srivastava and Du (2008); Wang et al. (2015); Zhong et al. (2013). These tests are generally effective when signals are dense and relatively small but tend to lose power when dealing with sparse signals. To address the limitations of L_2 norm-based methods in detecting sparse and strong signals, L_∞ norm-based methods have been proposed by Cai et al. (2014); Chang et al. (2017); Xue and Yao (2020). These methods provide higher power in scenarios where the alternative hypothesis involves sparse signals. Furthermore, adaptive methods that combine the strengths of both L_2 norm-based and L_∞ norm-based approaches have been introduced by He et al. (2021) and Xu et al. (2016). They proposed a relatively robust testing method by combining different L_q norms, which is adaptable to alternative hypotheses with unknown levels of signal sparsity. Finally, the fifth category of methods involves random projections, as studied by Srivastava et al. (2016); Thulin (2014) and others.

In contrast to the extensive research on independent data, relatively few studies have focused on testing high-dimensional means in temporally dependent data. Motivated by Bai and Saranadasa (1996); Ayyala et al. (2017) considers a M-dependent strictly stationary Gaussian process, and examined the L_2 norm of the sample average and investigated its asymptotic normality. In addition, Zhang et al. (2025) proposed a band-excluded U-statistic by removing the inner products between pairs of observations that are sufficiently distant from each other in the construction of the L_2 norm-based test statistic. They also established the asymptotic normality of this test statistic with β -mixing dependence. However, their method incurs a substantial computational cost, primarily due to the use of U-statistic-based estimators for estimating the asymptotic variance of the test statistic.

In this paper, we proposed a test statistic by removing all the inner products of

the observations from the L_2 norm of the sample average. Compared to the method of Ayyala et al. (2017), our approach can enhance higher power, as previously demonstrated by Chen and Qin (2010) under the independent setting. Furthermore, we demonstrate the asymptotic normality of the test statistic without relying on the stringent assumptions of Gaussian distribution or M -dependent structure among the observations. In our investigation of the theoretical properties, we assume that the data exhibit a linear dependence structure across observations. The primary contribution of this paper lies in the technical proof methodology. Importantly, our theoretical framework holds potential for extension to other high-dimensional problems involving temporal dependent data. Additionally, the computational burden of our method is significantly lower than that of Zhang et al. (2025), as will be illustrated in the simulation studies in Section 3. Through this work, we aim to contribute to the understanding of mean testing in high-dimensional dependent data, offering a powerful and efficient approach that is better suited to handling the dependencies among components and observations.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. In section 2, we introduce the test statistic, and its asymptotic distribution under the null hypothesis. We conduct extensive simulation studies in Section 3. An empirical application is provided in Section 4. Section 5 contains some discussions. All technical details are included in the Appendix.

2 Our Methods

2.1 Test statistic

We consider a p -dimensional stationary time series $\{\mathbf{X}_t = (X_{t,1}, \dots, X_{t,p})^\top\}_{t=1}^n$ with mean $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ and auto-covariance structure given by $\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_h = \text{Cov}(\mathbf{X}_t, \mathbf{X}_{t+h})$ for $h = -(n-1), \dots, (n-1)$. We are interested in testing

$$H_0 : \boldsymbol{\mu} = \mathbf{0} \quad \text{versus} \quad H_1 : \boldsymbol{\mu} \neq \mathbf{0}. \quad (1)$$

In this paper, we propose the following test statistic

$$T_n = \frac{1}{2} \left(n \bar{\mathbf{X}}_n^\top \bar{\mathbf{X}}_n - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n \mathbf{X}_t^\top \mathbf{X}_t \right), \quad (2)$$

where $\bar{\mathbf{X}}_n = n^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^n \mathbf{X}_t$. The problem of testing high-dimensional location parameters has been extensively studied for independent data, with notable contributions including Bai and Saranadasa (1996), Srivastava (2009), Chen and Qin

(2010), et al. Recently, the literature has been extended to the high-dimensional settings, with works such as Ayyala et al. (2017) and Zhang et al. (2025) proposing test statistics that estimate the L_2 -type distance $\boldsymbol{\mu}^\top \boldsymbol{\mu}$ to quantify the discrepancy between the null and alternative hypotheses. Below, we provide a detailed mutual comparison of our proposed method with those of Ayyala et al. (2017) and Zhang et al. (2025).

Ayyala et al. (2017) were among the first to address this problem in the context of high-dimensional dependent data. They assumed the data follows the high-dimensional M -dependent Gaussian stationary processes and proposed a test statistic based on the squared Euclidean norm of the sample mean vector, namely, $T_{\text{APR}} = \bar{\mathbf{X}}_n^\top \bar{\mathbf{X}}_n$. To address bias induced by the autocovariance structure, they constructed an unbiased estimator for $\mathbb{E}(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_n^\top \bar{\mathbf{X}}_n)$ and developed a ratio-consistent estimator for the asymptotic variance of the test statistic. Furthermore, they established the asymptotic normality under the null hypothesis as both sample size n and the dimension p tend to infinity, by assuming $p = O(n)$, $M = O(n^{1/8})$, and $\text{tr}\{\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_a \boldsymbol{\Gamma}_b \boldsymbol{\Gamma}_c \boldsymbol{\Gamma}_d\} = o\{\text{tr}^2(\boldsymbol{\Omega}_n^2)\}$ for any $a, b, c, d = 0, \dots, M$, where $\boldsymbol{\Omega}_n$ denotes the covariance matrix of $\bar{\mathbf{X}}_n$ multiplied by n . A key limitation, however, is that their asymptotic theory relies heavily on the Gaussian process assumption. By relaxing the M -dependent Gaussian assumption, Zhang et al. (2025) introduced a band-excluded U-statistic (BEU) to estimate the L_2 norm of the population mean vector. Their test statistic is $T_{\text{ZCQ}} = (n - b)(n - b + 1)^{-1} \sum_{|t_1 - t_2| \geq b} \mathbf{X}_{t_1}^\top \mathbf{X}_{t_2}$, where b is an exclusion bandwidth parameter. By systematically excluding cross-products of data vectors at temporally close points, their approach mitigates bias caused by long-range temporal dependencies. They studied the asymptotic theory of the BEU-statistic under a linear innovation model with β -mixing conditions. They considered two regimes of decay: exponential, which allows p to grow exponentially with n , and polynomial, which requires $p = O(n^\tau)$ for some $\tau > 0$. To estimate the asymptotic variance of the test statistic under the null hypothesis, they applied a similar band-exclusion technique and employed a kernel-smoothing technique with a quadratic spectral kernel, though this involves the substantial computational cost and nuisance bandwidth parameter.

Relative to Ayyala et al. (2017), we propose a test statistic by removing the terms of diagonal cross-product terms to enhance the power performance, which is inspired by Chen and Qin (2010). We adapt this insight to the dependent data framework. More fundamentally, our method diverges by relaxing the restrictive M -dependent Gaussian assumption to a more general linear process framework. Compared to the method of Zhang et al. (2025), the key difference lies in the estimation of the asymptotic variance. We leverage a sample-splitting technique for the variance estimation of the asymptotic variance of the test statistic under a linear process frame-

work. This fundamental difference circumvents the need for selecting the nuisance kernel smoothing parameter required in Zhang et al. (2025). Furthermore, by departing from the U-statistic formulation, our method achieves a significant reduction in computational burden while maintaining theoretical consistency, rendering it more practical for large-scale applications.

2.2 Main results

Define $\mathbf{\Omega}_n$, the covariance matrix of $\bar{\mathbf{X}}_n$ multiplied by the sample size,

$$\mathbf{\Omega}_n = \mathbf{\Gamma}_0 + 2 \sum_{h=1}^{n-1} \left(1 - \frac{h}{n}\right) \mathbf{\Gamma}_h,$$

and $\mathbf{\Omega} = \mathbf{\Gamma}_0 + 2 \sum_{h=1}^{\infty} \mathbf{\Gamma}_h$. For investigating the asymptotic normality of T_n , we assume the following assumptions in the analysis.

Assumption 1. For $t = 1, \dots, n$, $\mathbf{X}_t = \boldsymbol{\mu} + \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \mathbf{Y}_t$, where $\mathbf{Y}_t = (Y_{t,1}, \dots, Y_{t,p})^\top$ with $Y_{t,j} = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} b_k Z_{t-k,j}$, and $\{Z_{t,j}\}$ are independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) random variables with $\mathbb{E}[Z_{t,j}] = 0$, $\mathbb{E}[Z_{t,j}^2] = 1$ and $\mathbb{E}[Z_{t,j}^4] = \mu_4 < \infty$.

Assumption 2. There exist two positive constants C_0 and C_1 such that $\|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}\|_2 \leq C_0$ and $\text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma})/p \geq C_1$. Here $\|\cdot\|_2$ stands for the spectral norm of a matrix.

Assumption 3. (i) $b_n = o(n^{-5})$, i.e. $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} n^5 b_n = 0$; (ii) $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} b_k = s \neq 0$; (iii) $p = O(n)$ and $p \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Assumption 1 assume the linear process model of $\{\mathbf{X}_t\}_{t=1}^n$, which is widely used in time series analysis (Brockwell and Davis 2013; Zhang et al. 2018). This linear process model cover the well known MA(q) model and AR(1) model. Under the Assumption 1, we have $\mathbf{\Gamma}_h = a_h \boldsymbol{\Sigma}$, where $a_h = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} b_k b_{k+h}$. Assumption 2 implies that the correlation between the variables cannot be excessively large. Assumptions 3-(i) and 3-(ii) ensure that the temporal correlation becomes negligible as n increases. Assumption 3-(iii) allows the dimension p to increase to infinity as n approaches infinity, which is a significant departure from the assumption that n approaches infinity before p does in Breitung and Das (2005).

Based on simple calculations, we have $\mathbb{E}(T_n) = \sum_{h=1}^{n-1} (1 - \frac{h}{n}) \text{tr}(\mathbf{\Gamma}_h)$ under H_0 . Let $M = \lceil \min(n, p)^{1/8} \rceil$, we replace $\mathbb{E}(T_n)$ by

$$\mu_n = \sum_{h=1}^M \left(1 - \frac{h}{n}\right) \text{tr}(\mathbf{\Gamma}_h). \quad (3)$$

Due to the multiple occurrences of fourth moments, the variance of T_n has a complicated structure. Define

$$\sigma_n^2 = \frac{1}{2} \text{tr}(\Omega^2). \quad (4)$$

To address this issue, we use σ_n^2 to approximate $\text{Var}(T_n)$ under H_0 .

Theorem 2.1. *Under Assumptions 1–4 and H_0 , if $M = \lceil \min(n, p)^{1/8} \rceil$, as $n \rightarrow \infty$,*

$$(T_n - \mu_n) / \sqrt{\sigma_n^2} \xrightarrow{d} N(0, 1), \quad (5)$$

where μ_n and σ_n is defined in (3) and (4), respectively.

In order to construct the test statistic that can be used for the hypothesis test (1), we need to estimate μ_n and σ_n^2 . We consider estimating $\text{tr}(\Gamma_h)$ with

$$\text{tr}(\hat{\Gamma}_h) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^{n-h} (\mathbf{X}_t - \bar{\mathbf{X}}_n)^\top (\mathbf{X}_{t+h} - \bar{\mathbf{X}}_n),$$

and naturally propose the plug in estimator

$$\hat{\mu}_n = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{h=1}^M \sum_{t=1}^{n-h} \frac{n-h}{n} (\mathbf{X}_t - \bar{\mathbf{X}}_n)^\top (\mathbf{X}_{t+h} - \bar{\mathbf{X}}_n) \quad (6)$$

for μ_n . We next find a ratio consistent estimator of σ_n^2 . Ayyala et al. (2017) introduced an unbiased estimator of σ_n^2 . Their approach involves constructing a specific set of subscripts, ensuring that only pairwise correlations exist among the four samples in each component of the estimator. However, the consistency of their method is demonstrated under M -dependent Gaussian assumption. Building on this, Zhang et al. (2018) propose a new estimator which is suitable for some special correlation structure. Motivated by Zhang et al. (2018), we select the datapair $(\mathbf{X}_t, \mathbf{X}_s)$ that are sufficiently separated in time. Specifically, we require $|s - t| \geq \lfloor n/2 \rfloor \gg M$, which make sure \mathbf{X}_t and \mathbf{X}_s are approximately independent under the assumed dependence structure. This allows us to use two non-overlapping segments of the series to estimate Γ_{h_1} and Γ_{h_2} independently. Thus, we propose

$$S_{h_1, h_2} = \frac{\sum_{t=1}^{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor - h_2} \sum_{s=t+\lfloor n/2 \rfloor}^{n-h_2} (\mathbf{X}_t - \bar{\mathbf{X}}_n)^\top (\mathbf{X}_s - \bar{\mathbf{X}}_n) (\mathbf{X}_{t+h_1} - \bar{\mathbf{X}}_n)^\top (\mathbf{X}_{s+h_2} - \bar{\mathbf{X}}_n)}{(n - h_2/2 - \frac{3}{2}\lfloor n/2 \rfloor + 1/2)(\lfloor n/2 \rfloor - h_2)}. \quad (7)$$

to estimate $\text{tr}(\mathbf{\Gamma}_{h_1}\mathbf{\Gamma}_{h_2})$. It follows that

$$\hat{\sigma}_n^2 = \frac{1}{2} \left(S_{0,0} + 2 \sum_{h_1=1}^M S_{h_1,0} + 2 \sum_{h_2=1}^M S_{0,h_2} + 4 \sum_{h_1=1}^M \sum_{h_2=1}^M S_{h_1,h_2} \right). \quad (8)$$

Theorem 2.2. *Under Assumptions 1–4 and H_0 , if $M = \lceil \min(n, p)^{1/8} \rceil$, as $n \rightarrow \infty$,*

$$(T_n - \hat{\mu}_n) / \sqrt{\hat{\sigma}_n^2} \xrightarrow{d} N(0, 1). \quad (9)$$

According to Theorem 2.2, we reject the null hypothesis when $(T_n - \hat{\mu}_n) / \sqrt{\hat{\sigma}_n^2} > z_\alpha$, where z_α is the upper α -quantile of the standard normal distribution $N(0, 1)$ for a level α test.

3 Simulation Study

In this section, we conduct a comparative analysis between our proposed method, referred to as T_n , and two established test approaches: the method developed by Srivastava (2009) for independent data, denoted as T_{SRI} , and the approach introduced by Zhang et al. (2025) for β -mixing dependent data, denoted as T_{ZCQ} . We exclude the test proposed by Ayyala et al. (2017) from this comparison due to the Gaussian M -dependent assumption, as well as its substantial computational demands.

We consider the following generating model

$$\mathbf{X}_t = \boldsymbol{\mu} + \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \sum_{h=0}^q \mathbf{A}_h \mathbf{Z}_{t-h}, \quad (10)$$

where $\mathbf{A}_0, \dots, \mathbf{A}_q$ are $p \times p$ symmetric matrices which determine the autocovariance structure of \mathbf{X}_t , and $Z_{t,j}$ are independently and identically distributed from $N(0, 1)$ and $\text{Gamma}(4, 2) - 2$. Besides that, we set $\mathbf{A}_0 = \mathbf{I}_p$, and for $h = 1, 2$,

$$\mathbf{A}_{h,i,j} = \begin{cases} \frac{\phi_1}{h} & |i - j| = 0, \\ \frac{\phi_1}{h|i - j|^2} & 1 \leq |i - j| \leq pw, \\ 0 & |i - j| > pw, \end{cases} \quad \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{i,j} = \begin{cases} 1 & |i - j| = 0, \\ \frac{\phi_2}{|i - j|^2} & 1 \leq |i - j| \leq pw, \\ 0 & |i - j| > pw, \end{cases}$$

where $(w, \phi_1, \phi_2) = (0.5, 0.3, 0.2)$. Here, w represents the sparsity and (ϕ_1, ϕ_2) control the strength of dependence between the variables. For $h > 2$, we simply consider $\mathbf{A}_{h,i,j} = e^{-2h}$. In this paper, we choose $q = 0, 2, n - 1$ in model (10) to mimic

the independent and dependent cases. To apply our proposed method effectively, we recommend taking $M = \lceil \min(n, p)^{1/8} \rceil$. For the comparison, we followed the recommendation outlined in Zhang et al. (2025) and take the lag window of their method as $\lfloor n/10 \rfloor$. We set the nominal significance level $\alpha = 0.05$, and all the simulation results are based on 1000 replications.

Table 1 summarizes the empirical sizes of the three tests under the null hypothesis. When $q = 0$, indicating temporal independent, all testing procedures efficiently control the empirical type I error across a wide range of sample sizes and dimensions. However, under dependency setting, that is $q = 2$ and $q = n - 1$, the T_{SRI} test exhibits notable deviation from the nominal level, which is anticipated given their inability to account for the dependent structure. Compared to our method, the T_{ZCQ} test shows a slight deviation from the nominal significance level in empirical type I error evaluation. Overall, our proposed test T_n demonstrates superior robustness in maintaining the nominal size across different dependency scenarios.

Table 1: Empirical sizes (in %) of different tests under different scenarios.

n	p	$q = 0$			$q = 2$			$q = n - 1$		
		T_n	T_{ZCQ}	T_{SIR}	T_n	T_{ZCQ}	T_{SIR}	T_n	T_{ZCQ}	T_{SIR}
$Z_{t,j} \sim N(0, 1)$										
250	100	7.5	5.8	3.8	6.7	6.5	98.4	5.8	6	98.3
	300	6.8	5.2	3.2	6.4	5.8	100	7.2	6.1	100
	600	6.7	5.8	1.4	6.8	4.3	100	7.3	4.8	100
500	100	6.5	5.6	4.8	7.2	7.4	98.8	7.2	7.3	98.7
	300	5.6	4.7	3.1	7.6	6.5	100	7.6	6.6	100
	600	6.4	4.7	2.3	7.6	6.8	100	7.2	6.4	100
$Z_{t,j} \sim \text{Gamma}(4, 2) - 2$										
250	100	6.4	4.9	5	7	8	98.7	6.7	7	98.2
	300	5.6	4.5	2.8	5.6	5.1	100	8	6	100
	600	6.2	4.9	1.5	6.9	4.9	100	7.1	4.6	100
500	100	5.6	4.8	4.6	6.2	6.4	98.6	7.6	7.7	98.9
	300	7	5.9	4.6	5.5	4.7	100	7.7	7.3	100
	600	7.1	5.9	3.6	6.7	6.7	100	7.3	5.8	100

To compare statistical power, we examine six scenarios with different parameter configurations of (n, p, q) : S1. $(n, p, q) = (250, 300, 0)$, S2. $(n, p, q) = (250, 300, 2)$, S3. $(n, p, q) = (250, 300, 249)$, S4. $(n, p, q) = (250, 100, 0)$, S5. $(n, p, q) = (250, 100, 2)$

and S6. $(n, p, q) = (250, 100, 249)$. Set $\mu = (\omega_{S_k} \phi_3 \mathbf{1}_{[\nu p]}^\top, \mathbf{0}_{p-[\nu p]}^\top)^\top$ with different scenarios of sparsity level $\nu \in \{0.2, 0.4, 0.8\}$ and signal strength $\phi_3 \in \{0.05, 0.06, 0.07, 0.08, 0.09\}$, with $\omega_{S_1} = \omega_{S_4} = 1$, $\omega_{S_2} = \omega_{S_5} = 0.4$, $\omega_{S_3} = \omega_{S_6} = 0.005$. The outcomes are depicted in Tables 3–6. It's evident that our proposed test, T_n , surpasses T_{ZCQ} test. Furthermore, the computational cost of our proposed method is approximately one-tenth that of T_{ZCQ} test, offering a significant advantage in terms of efficiency over the latter, which is presented in Table 2. This demonstrates that our method not only achieves better empirical power but also does so with a drastically reduced computational burden.

Table 2: Timings (in seconds) of different tests under the null hypothesis with Gaussian distributed data, averaged over 1000 replications.

n	p	$q = 0$			$q = 2$			$q = n - 1$		
		T_n	T_{ZCQ}	T_{SIR}	T_n	T_{ZCQ}	T_{SIR}	T_n	T_{ZCQ}	T_{SIR}
250	100	0.780	27.865	0.004	0.753	26.220	0.004	0.716	26.342	0.004
	300	1.293	72.004	0.047	1.265	73.016	0.048	1.275	71.536	0.046
	600	8.985	357.492	1.311	9.859	358.353	1.571	8.079	352.216	1.174
500	100	2.978	449.863	0.005	2.965	445.932	0.005	2.834	417.464	0.005
	300	8.922	1986.630	0.061	8.522	2311.324	0.060	8.802	2283.405	0.059
	600	26.122	2378.73	0.618	24.304	2515.59	0.597	26.083	2674.434	0.573

4 Real Data Analysis

In this section, we apply our proposed method to a pricing problem in finance, specifically exploring whether the weekly excess return of any asset is zero on average. Denote $X_{tj} = R_{tj} - \text{rf}_t$ by the excess return of the j th asset at time t for $t = 1, \dots, n$ and $j = 1, \dots, p$, where R_{tj} is the return on asset j during period t and rf_t is the risk-free return rate of all asset during period t . We study the zero-factor pricing model

$$\mathbf{X}_t = \boldsymbol{\mu} + \boldsymbol{\xi}_t, \quad t = 1, \dots, n,$$

where $\mathbf{X}_t = (X_{t1}, \dots, X_{tp})^\top$, $\boldsymbol{\mu} = (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_p)^\top$, and $\boldsymbol{\xi}_t = (\xi_{t1}, \dots, \xi_{tp})^\top$ is the zero-mean error vector. We consider the null hypothesis test $H_0 : \boldsymbol{\mu} = \mathbf{0}$, which means that, the return rate of any asset R_{tj} is equal to the risk-free return rate rf_t on average. We analyzed the weekly return rates of stocks in the S&P 500 index from

Table 3: Empirical powers (in %) of different tests under scenarios S1–S3 with Gaussian distributed data.

ν	ϕ_3	S1			S2		S3	
		T_n	T_{ZCQ}	T_{SIR}	T_n	T_{ZCQ}	T_n	T_{ZCQ}
0.2	0.05	48.6	43.9	29.6	15.9	14.3	18	15.7
	0.06	69.4	66.1	52.3	21.2	18.9	24.1	20.8
	0.07	85.5	83.1	74.5	28.6	25.5	32.2	28.3
	0.08	95.3	94.3	89.6	38.3	34.1	41.7	37.8
	0.09	98.8	98.7	97	48	44.8	52	48.1
0.4	0.05	46.6	41.6	29.9	28.1	24.8	32.8	29.1
	0.06	69.2	65.2	51	41.3	38.3	45.5	41.6
	0.07	85.2	82.6	73.9	57.7	54.9	60.4	57.1
	0.08	94.9	94.1	89.4	71.4	67.7	73.9	70.3
	0.09	98.7	98.3	96.4	83.3	81	85.4	84.1
0.8	0.05	48.9	44.3	30.9	58.3	53.5	59.2	55.9
	0.06	68.8	65.4	53.1	79.6	76.8	78.8	75.3
	0.07	85.6	83	74	91.4	89.5	90.6	89.6
	0.08	95.5	94.2	90.2	97.2	96.9	97.6	96.6
	0.09	99.2	99	97.1	99.2	99	99.4	99.2

Table 4: Empirical powers (in %) of different tests under scenarios S4–S6 with Gaussian distributed data.

ν	ϕ_3	S4			S5		S6	
		T_n	T_{ZCQ}	T_{SIR}	T_n	T_{ZCQ}	T_n	T_{ZCQ}
0.2	0.05	27.1	24.5	20.6	11.8	12	12.2	11.8
	0.06	37.5	34.3	31	14.5	14.9	15.5	14.8
	0.07	51.7	48.3	44.4	17.7	17.7	19.8	18.9
	0.08	66.5	64.9	60.4	22.1	21.3	25.3	23.9
	0.09	78.2	76.9	73.7	26	26	29.9	29.1
0.4	0.05	53.8	50.4	44.9	17.8	18	20	19.4
	0.06	72.8	70	66.6	24	23.8	28	27.1
	0.07	87.4	86.2	84.3	32.5	31.3	36.7	34.9
	0.08	95.3	94.2	92.7	42.8	40.4	44.1	43.5
	0.09	98.9	98.7	98.1	51.2	51.9	52.9	52.9
0.8	0.05	87.5	86.1	84.3	33	32.5	34.7	34.1
	0.06	97.2	96.7	96.5	46.3	45.9	48.7	48.7
	0.07	100	100	100	60.2	59.7	62.4	62.4
	0.08	100	100	100	73.6	73.1	75.4	74.9
	0.09	100	100	100	83.7	83.1	87.2	86.4

Table 5: Empirical powers (in %) of different tests under scenarios S1–S3 with Gamma distributed data.

ν	ϕ_3	S1			S2		S3	
		T_n	T_{ZCQ}	T_{SIR}	T_n	T_{ZCQ}	T_n	T_{ZCQ}
0.2	0.05	45.7	41.9	26.4	15.5	13	17.3	15.2
	0.06	67	62.7	45.5	20.9	18.6	25.1	20.6
	0.07	83.7	81.3	66.5	27.9	24.8	31.9	28.6
	0.08	94.9	92.9	85.3	35.3	31.9	42.2	38.4
	0.09	98.8	98.4	95.7	44.2	41.6	51.9	47.7
0.4	0.05	46.2	41.5	22.1	27.7	24.7	33	28.7
	0.06	65.7	61.6	41.3	41.9	38.6	46.1	42
	0.07	81.7	79.3	61.8	55.8	52.3	62	58.9
	0.08	93.1	92.2	80.2	70.7	66.4	74.5	71.3
	0.09	99	98.3	93.5	82.2	79.9	85	82.7
0.8	0.05	47.3	42.8	19.8	56.4	53	59	55.7
	0.06	67.8	64.2	36.7	76.9	73.8	77.1	74.7
	0.07	84.8	82.2	58	91.1	89.1	90	88.1
	0.08	95.6	94.6	79.4	98	97.6	96.6	95.7
	0.09	98.6	98.3	93.7	99.9	99.7	99	98.8

Table 6: Empirical powers (in %) of different tests under scenarios S4–S6 with Gamma distributed data.

ν	ϕ_3	S4			S5		S6	
		T_n	T_{ZCQ}	T_{SIR}	T_n	T_{ZCQ}	T_n	T_{ZCQ}
0.2	0.05	24.6	21.3	16.2	11.4	11.4	13.3	12.6
	0.06	34.7	32.3	24.8	13.4	13.6	15.9	15.1
	0.07	47	44.7	36.5	16.6	16.9	19.5	18.9
	0.08	62.5	59.5	52.1	20.1	20.2	23.6	23.6
	0.09	75.7	73.6	66.4	25	24	28.5	27.4
0.4	0.05	51.4	47.3	36.9	16.6	16.8	19.6	19.1
	0.06	69.9	67.7	57.6	23	23.1	26.4	25.3
	0.07	86.8	86.1	78.2	31.4	30.8	35.8	35.2
	0.08	95.3	94.6	91.8	39.6	39.3	44.1	43
	0.09	98.9	98.7	97.9	49.9	49.6	54.1	53.2
0.8	0.05	87.2	86.2	75.9	33.1	32.5	37.3	36.3
	0.06	97.9	97.3	95.2	46.6	45.8	50.5	49.6
	0.07	100	99.9	99.4	59.8	58.4	62.8	62.6
	0.08	100	100	100	73	72.1	76.5	76.2
	0.09	100	100	100	84.7	84.6	86.4	85.6

January 14, 2005, to November 24, 2023. The weekly data were calculated using the stock prices on Fridays. After deleting missing values, we obtained a dataset with $p = 393$ securities across $n = 888$ observations.


First, we examine the presence of time series dependence in the observed sequences of our dataset. To achieve this, we apply the Box-Pierce test, a traditional method for detecting autocorrelation. The p-value histogram from the Box-Pierce test for the U.S. datasets is shown in Figure 1–(a). We observe a significant number of p-values below 0.05, indicating that some observed sequences may exhibit autocorrelation. Furthermore, we employ the max-type high-dimensional white noise test procedure, as described by Feng et al. (2022), to assess whether the excess return are white noise. This test produces a p-value of zero, strongly suggesting time dependence among the sequences. Consequently, test procedures that assume independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) random vectors may not perform well and could yield inaccurate results.

We employed a rolling window procedure with a window length of $m = 260$ weeks (approximately 5 years) to evaluate the performance of our proposed T_n test and T_{zcq} test. Figure 1–(b) displays the p-values for each test procedure over time, with the black horizontal line representing the 0.05 significance level. In the first nine years and the last eight years, both T_n test and T_{zcq} test failed to reject the null hypothesis, suggesting that the weekly excess returns of any asset may be zero on average during these periods. However, during the five-year period in the middle, both the T_n test and T_{zcq} test frequently reject the null hypothesis, indicating that the weekly excess returns of any asset were not zero on average in the interval. It is noteworthy that our proposed test demonstrated a stronger rejection of the null hypothesis compared to the T_{zcq} test, indicating higher sensitivity and potentially greater accuracy in detecting deviations from zero weekly excess returns.


5 Conclusion

In this study, we introduce a novel mean test method for high-dimensional data, accommodating both cross-sectional and time series dependencies. The asymptotic normality of the proposed test statistic is established as both p and n approach infinity concurrently. The tests presented in this paper follow a sum-type procedure, exhibiting robust performance under dense alternatives when the time series of a majority of variables are depart from zero. An intriguing challenge is to develop a max-type test procedure that performs well under sparse alternatives, where the time series of a handful of variables are depart from zero.

Moreover, several studies, including Feng et al. (2024) and Chen et al. (2024),



(a) An example of an individual figure sub-caption.



(b) A slightly shorter sub-caption.

Figure 1: U.S.'s weekly datasets.

have explored the asymptotic independence between sum-type and max-type test procedures. Therefore, it would be fascinating to investigate the asymptotic independence between these two types of procedures in the context of high-dimensional unit root testing.

References

- Ayyala, D. N., Park, J., and Roy, A. (2017). Mean vector testing for high-dimensional dependent observations. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, 153:136–155.
- Bai, Z. and Saranadasa, H. (1996). Effect of high dimension: by an example of a two sample problem. *Statistica Sinica*, 6:311–329.
- Breitung, J. and Das, S. (2005). Panel unit root tests under cross-sectional dependence. *Statistica Neerlandica*, 59(4):414–433.
- Brockwell, P. J. and Davis, R. A. (2013). Time series: Theory and methods. Springer science & business media.
- Cai, T., Liu, W., and Xia, Y. (2014). Two-sample test of high dimensional means under dependence. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology*, 76(2):349–372.

- Chang, J., Zheng, C., Zhou, W.-X., and Zhou, W. (2017). Simulation-based hypothesis testing of high dimensional means under covariance heterogeneity. *Biometrics*, 73(4):1300–1310.
- Chen, D. C., Feng, L., and Liang, D. C. (2024). Asymptotic independence of the quadratic form and maximum of independent random variables with applications to high-dimensional tests. *Acta Mathematica Sinica, English Series*, 40(12):3093–3126.
- Chen, L. S., Paul, D., Prentice, R. L., and Wang, P. (2011). A regularized hotelling’s T^2 test for pathway analysis in proteomic studies. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 106(496):1345–1360.
- Chen, S., Li, J., and Zhong, P.-S. (2019). Two-sample and anova tests for high dimensional means. *The Annals of Statistics*, 47(3):1443–1474.
- Chen, S. and Qin, Y.-L. (2010). A two-sample test for high-dimensional data with applications to gene-set testing. *The Annals of Statistics*, 38(2):808–835.
- Cho, S., Lim, J., Ayyala, D. N., Park, J., and Roy, A. (2019). Note on mean vector testing for high-dimensional dependent observations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1904.09344*.
- Feng, L., Jiang, T., Li, X., and Liu, B. (2024). Asymptotic independence of the sum and maximum of dependent random variables with applications to high-dimensional tests. *Statistica Sinica*, 34:1745–1763.
- Feng, L., Liu, B., and Ma, Y. (2022). Testing for high-dimensional white noise. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.02964*.
- Feng, L., Zou, C., and Wang, Z. (2016). Multivariate-sign-based high-dimensional tests for the two-sample location problem. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 111(514):721–735.
- Gregory, K. B., Carroll, R. J., Baladandayuthapani, V., and Lahiri, S. N. (2015). A two-sample test for equality of means in high dimension. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 110(510):837–849.
- He, Y., Xu, G., Wu, C., and Pan, W. (2021). Asymptotically independent u-statistics in high-dimensional testing. *Annals of statistics*, 49(1):154.

- Huang, Y., Li, C., Li, R., and Yang, S. (2022). An overview of tests on high-dimensional means. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, 188:104813.
- Li, H., Aue, A., Paul, D., Peng, J., and Wang, P. (2020). An adaptable generalization of hotelling's t^2 test in high dimension. *The Annals of Statistics*, 48(3):1815–1847.
- Li, Y., Wang, Z., and Zou, C. (2016). A simpler spatial-sign-based two-sample test for high-dimensional data. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, 149:192–198.
- Pollard, D. (2012). Convergence of stochastic processes. Springer Science & Business Media.
- Srivastava, M. S. (2009). A test for the mean vector with fewer observations than the dimension under non-normality. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, 100(3):518–532.
- Srivastava, M. S. and Du, M. (2008). A test for the mean vector with fewer observations than the dimension. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, 99(3):386–402.
- Srivastava, R., Li, P., and Ruppert, D. (2016). Raptt: An exact two-sample test in high dimensions using random projections. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics*, 25(3):954–970.
- Thulin, M. (2014). A high-dimensional two-sample test for the mean using random subspaces. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis*, 74:26–38.
- Wang, L., Peng, B., and Li, R. (2015). A high-dimensional nonparametric multivariate test for mean vector. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 110(512):1658–1669.
- Xu, G., Lin, L., Wei, P., and Pan, W. (2016). An adaptive two-sample test for high-dimensional means. *Biometrika*, 103(3):609–624.
- Xue, K. and Yao, F. (2020). Distribution and correlation-free two-sample test of high-dimensional means. *The Annals of Statistics*, 48(3):1304–1328.
- Zhang, B., Pan, G., and Gao, J. (2018). CLT for largest eigenvalues and unit root testing for high-dimensional nonstationary time series. *The Annals of Statistics*, 46(5):2186–2215.
- Zhang, S., Chen, S. X., and Qiu, Y. (2025). Mean tests for high-dimensional time series. *Statistica Sinica*, 35(1):171–201.

Zhong, P.-S., Chen, S. X., and Xu, M. (2013). Tests alternative to higher criticism for high-dimensional means under sparsity and column-wise dependence. *The Annals of Statistics*, 41(6):2820–2851.

A Notations

Let $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_t = \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \mathbf{Y}_t$, we define a M -dependent approximation sequence for $\{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_t\}_{t=1}^n$ as follows,

$$\boldsymbol{\gamma}_t^{(M)} = \mathbb{E}[\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_t | \mathbf{Z}_{t-M}, \dots, \mathbf{Z}_t] = \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \sum_{k=0}^M b_k \mathbf{Z}_{t-k},$$

where $M = \lceil \min(n, p)^{1/8} \rceil$. In order to simplify notation, we omit the superscript in the absence of ambiguity. By replacing the $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_t$ in T_n with $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_t^{(M)}$, we define

$$T_n^{(NG)} = \frac{1}{2} (n \bar{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_n^\top \bar{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_n - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n \boldsymbol{\gamma}_t^\top \boldsymbol{\gamma}_t),$$

where $\bar{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_n = n^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^n \boldsymbol{\gamma}_t$. Let $a_{h,M} = \sum_{k=0}^{M-h} b_k b_{k+h}$, we define the auto-covariance matrices of $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_t^{(M)}$ at lag h as

$$\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_{h,M} = \mathbb{E}[\boldsymbol{\gamma}_t \boldsymbol{\gamma}_{t+h}^\top] = a_{h,M} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}, \quad h = 0, 1, \dots, M,$$

and $\boldsymbol{\Omega}_{n,M} = \boldsymbol{\Gamma}_{0,M} + 2 \sum_{h=1}^M (1 - \frac{h}{n}) \boldsymbol{\Gamma}_{h,M}$. Let $\{\boldsymbol{\delta}_t\}_{t=1}^n$ be a Gaussian sequence which is independent of $\{\boldsymbol{\gamma}_t\}_{t=1}^n$ and preserves the auto-covariance structure of $\{\boldsymbol{\gamma}_t\}_{t=1}^n$, i.e. $\mathbb{E}[\boldsymbol{\delta}_t \boldsymbol{\delta}_{t+h}^\top] = \boldsymbol{\Gamma}_{h,M}$. Similarly, with $\bar{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_n = n^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^n \boldsymbol{\delta}_t$, we define

$$T_n^{(G)} = \frac{1}{2} (n \bar{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_n^\top \bar{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_n - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n \boldsymbol{\delta}_t^\top \boldsymbol{\delta}_t).$$

B Important Lemmas

We first establish the following lemmas which will be frequently used in our subsequent proofs.

Lemma B.1. *Let $\mathbf{W} = \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} a_t \mathbf{Z}_t$, where $\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} |a_t| < \infty$, there exists a positive constant $\tau_1 \geq 3$ such that for all $p \times p$ positive semi-definite matrix \mathbf{B} satisfy*

$$\mathbb{E}[(\mathbf{W}^\top \mathbf{B} \mathbf{W})^2] \leq \tau_1 [\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{W}^\top \mathbf{B} \mathbf{W})]^2.$$

Proof Let $[B]_{ij}$ denotes the entry in row i , column j of \mathbf{B} . Since \mathbf{B} is positive semi-definite matrix, $\mathbf{B} = \mathbf{D}\mathbf{\Lambda}\mathbf{D}^\top$, where \mathbf{D} is an orthogonal matrix and $\mathbf{\Lambda} = \text{diag}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_p)$, $\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_p \geq 0$. Let $\mathbf{Z}'_t = \mathbf{D}^\top \mathbf{Z}_t$, we can calculate their second and fourth moments

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[Z'_{t,j}{}^2] &= \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{i=1}^p [D]_{ij} Z_{t,i}\right]^2 = 1, \\ \mathbb{E}[Z'_{t,j}{}^4] &= \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{i=1}^p [D]_{ij} Z_{t,i}\right]^4 = \sum_{i=1}^p [D]_{ij}^4 (\mu_4 - 3) + 3 \leq \mu_4.\end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[(\mathbf{W}^\top \mathbf{B} \mathbf{W})] &= \sum_{r=1}^p [B]_{r,r} \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} a_i Z_{i,r}\right)^2\right] = \sum_{r=1}^p [B]_{r,r} \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} a_i^2 = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} a_i^2 \text{tr}(\mathbf{B}), \\ \mathbb{E}[(\mathbf{W}^\top \mathbf{B} \mathbf{W})^2] &= \sum_{1 \leq r_1, r_2, r_3, r_4 \leq p} [B]_{r_1, r_2} [B]_{r_3, r_4} \mathbb{E}\left[\prod_{j=1}^4 \left(\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} a_i Z_{i, r_j}\right)\right] \\ &= \sum_{r=1}^p [B]_{rr}^2 \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} a_i Z_{i, r}\right]^4 \\ &\quad + \sum_{r \neq s} (2[B]_{r,s}^2 + [B]_{r,r} [B]_{s,s}) \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} a_i Z_{i, r}\right)^2 \left(\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} a_i Z_{i, s}\right)^2\right] \\ &= \sum_{r=1}^p [B]_{r,r}^2 \left(\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} a_i^4 \mu_4 + \sum_{i \neq j} 3a_i^2 a_j^2\right) + \sum_{r \neq s} (2[B]_{r,s}^2 + [B]_{r,r} [B]_{s,s}) \left(\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} a_i^2\right)^2 \\ &\leq \text{tr}(\mathbf{B})^2 \left(\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} a_i^4 \mu_4 + \sum_{i \neq j} 3a_i^2 a_j^2\right) + (2 \text{tr}(\mathbf{B}^2) + \text{tr}(\mathbf{B})^2) \left(\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} a_i^2\right)^2 \\ &\leq (\mu_4 + 6) \left(\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} a_i^2\right)^2 \text{tr}(\mathbf{B})^2 = (\mu_4 + 6) [\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{W}^\top \mathbf{B} \mathbf{W})]^2.\end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof by taking $\tau_1 = \mu_4 + 6$. ■

Lemma B.2. Under Assumptions 1–3, for all k_1, k_2, k_3, k_4 , there exists a constant τ_2 such that

$$\left| \mathbb{E}[\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{k_1}^\top \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{k_2} - \text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_{|k_1 - k_2|})] [\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{k_3}^\top \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{k_4} - \text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_{|k_3 - k_4|})] \right| \leq \tau_2 \text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\Omega}^2).$$

Proof

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \mathbb{E} [\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{k_1}^\top \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{k_2} - \text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_{|k_1-k_2|})] [\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{k_3}^\top \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{k_4} - \text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_{|k_3-k_4|})] \right| \\ & \leq \left\{ \mathbb{E} [\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{k_1}^\top \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{k_2} - \text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_{|k_1-k_2|})]^2 \mathbb{E} [\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{k_3}^\top \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{k_4} - \text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_{|k_3-k_4|})]^2 \right\}^{1/2} \end{aligned}$$

It suffice to prove, for all $h \geq 0$,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[(\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_0^\top \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_h - \text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_h))^2 \right] \leq \tau_2 \text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\Omega}^2).$$

We split $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_h$ into two independent parts

$$\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_h = \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} b_{k+h} \mathbf{Z}_{-k} + \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \sum_{k=0}^{h-1} b_k \mathbf{Z}_{h-k} := \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{h,(1)} + \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{h,(2)}.$$

Then we can simplify $\mathbb{E} \left[(\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_0^\top \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_h - \text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_h))^2 \right]$ as follows,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[(\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_0^\top \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_h - \text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_h))^2 \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[(\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_0^\top \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{h,(1)} - \text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_h))^2 \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[(\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_0^\top \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{h,(2)})^2 \right].$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[(\mathbf{Z}_r^\top \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \mathbf{Z}_s)^2 \right] = \text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^2), \\ & \mathbb{E} \left[(\mathbf{Z}_k^\top \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \mathbf{Z}_k - \text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}))^2 \right] = 2 \text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^2) + (\mu_4 - 1) \text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma} \odot \boldsymbol{\Sigma}) \leq (\mu_4 + 1) \text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^2), \end{aligned}$$

where \odot denotes Hadamard product. Then, we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[(\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_0^\top \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{h,(2)})^2 \right] = \left(\sum_{k=0}^{h-1} b_k^2 \right) \left(\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} b_k^2 \right) \text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^2)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[(\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_0^\top \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{h,(1)} - \text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_h))^2 \right] \\ & = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} b_k^2 b_{k+h}^2 \mathbb{E} [(\mathbf{Z}_k^\top \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \mathbf{Z}_k - \text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}))^2] + \sum_{k,l=0, k \neq l}^{\infty} b_k b_{l+h} b_l b_{k+h} \mathbb{E} (\mathbf{Z}_k^\top \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \mathbf{Z}_l \mathbf{Z}_l^\top \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \mathbf{Z}_k) \\ & \quad + \sum_{k,l=0, k \neq l}^{\infty} b_k^2 b_{l+h}^2 \mathbb{E} (\mathbf{Z}_k^\top \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \mathbf{Z}_l \mathbf{Z}_k^\top \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \mathbf{Z}_l) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq (\mu_4 + 1) \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} b_k^2 b_{k+h}^2 \operatorname{tr}(\Sigma^2) + \sum_{k,l=0, k \neq l}^{\infty} (b_k b_{l+h} b_l b_{k+h} + b_k^2 b_{l+h}^2) \operatorname{tr}(\Sigma^2) \\
&\leq \left\{ (\mu_4 + 1) \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} b_k^2 b_{k+h}^2 + \left(\sum_{r=0}^{\infty} b_r b_{r+h} \right)^2 + \left(\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} b_k^2 \right) \left(\sum_{l=0}^{\infty} b_{l+h}^2 \right) \right\} \operatorname{tr}(\Sigma^2) \\
&\leq (\mu_4 + 3) \left(\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} b_k^2 \right)^2 \operatorname{tr}(\Sigma^2).
\end{aligned}$$

It completes the proof with $\operatorname{tr}(\Omega^2) = \left(\sum_{h_1=-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} b_k b_{k+h_1} \right)^2 \operatorname{tr}(\Sigma^2)$ and $b_n = o(n^{-5})$. ■

Let $b_{k,M} := b_k \mathbf{1}_{\{k \leq M\}}$, applying the similar technique analysis, we get the following lemma of γ_k .

Lemma B.3. *Under Assumptions 1–3, for all k_1, k_2, k_3, k_4 , there exists a constant τ_2 such that*

$$|\mathbb{E} [\gamma_{k_1}^\top \gamma_{k_2} - \operatorname{tr}(\Gamma_{|k_1-k_2|,M})] [\gamma_{k_3}^\top \gamma_{k_4} - \operatorname{tr}(\Gamma_{|k_3-k_4|,M})]| \leq \tau_2 \operatorname{tr}(\Omega_{n,M}^2).$$

Lemma B.4. *Let $\{b_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ is a sequence of numbers, if there exist a constant $k > 1$ such that $b_n = o(n^{-k})$, then*

$$\sum_{m=n}^{\infty} b_m = o(n^{-(k-1)}).$$

Proof For any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $N \in \mathbb{N}$, such that for all $n \geq N$, $n^k |b_n| \leq \epsilon$. Then for all $n \geq N$, $k > 1$, we have

$$n^{k-1} \left| \sum_{m=n}^{\infty} b_m \right| = \left| \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=mn}^{(m+1)n-1} \frac{(mn)^k}{m^k} b_t \right| \leq \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=mn}^{(m+1)n-1} \left| \frac{t^k}{m^k} b_t \right| \leq \epsilon \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{m^k} < \infty. \quad \blacksquare$$

B.1 Proof of Theorem 2.1

Note that

$$\frac{T_n - \mu_n}{\sqrt{\sigma_n^2}} = \frac{\sqrt{\operatorname{tr}(\Omega_{n,M}^2)/2}}{\sqrt{\sigma_n^2}} \left(\frac{T_n^{(G)} - \mu_n}{\sqrt{\operatorname{tr}(\Omega_{n,M}^2)/2}} + \frac{T_n^{(NG)} - T_n^{(G)}}{\sqrt{\operatorname{tr}(\Omega_{n,M}^2)/2}} + \frac{T_n - T_n^{(NG)}}{\sqrt{\operatorname{tr}(\Omega_{n,M}^2)/2}} \right).$$

Our proof is mainly divided into the following three parts: first, we prove the asymptotic normality of $T_n^{(G)}$ in Lemma B.5, then we use some Gaussian approximation approach to prove the asymptotic normality of $T_n^{(NG)}$ in Lemma B.7. Finally, we use $T_n^{(NG)}$ to approximate T_n in Lemma B.13. Besides that, we need to prove $\text{tr}(\mathbf{\Omega}_{n,M}^2) = \sigma_n^2(1 + o(1))$. Then, it completes the proof of Theorem 2.1.

B.1.1 Part 1

Lemma B.5. *Under Assumptions 1–3 and H_0 holds, as $n \rightarrow \infty$,*

$$\frac{T_n^{(G)} - \mathbb{E}[T_n^{(G)}]}{\sqrt{\text{tr}(\mathbf{\Omega}_{n,M}^2)/2}} \xrightarrow{d} N(0, 1) \quad (11)$$

Proof Based on simple calculations, we have $\mathbb{E}[T_n^{(G)}] = [\text{tr}(\mathbf{\Omega}_{n,M}) - \text{tr}(\mathbf{\Gamma}_{0,M})]/2$. Let $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\delta}} = (\boldsymbol{\delta}_1^\top, \dots, \boldsymbol{\delta}_n^\top)^\top$, then $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\delta}} \sim N(\mathbf{0}_{np}, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}})$, where $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}} = \sum_{h \in \mathcal{M}} \mathbf{D}_h \otimes \mathbf{\Gamma}_{h,M}$, \mathbf{D}_h is the $n \times n$ matrix with $[D_h]_{ij} = 1$ if $i - j = h$ and $[D_h]_{ij} = 0$ otherwise. Let $\mathbf{1}_n$ be the n -dimensional vector with all elements one, \mathbf{I}_n be the $n \times n$ identity matrix, and $\mathcal{M} = \{-M, \dots, M\}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var}(T_n^{(G)}) &= \frac{1}{4n^2} \text{Var} \left(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\delta}}^\top [\mathbf{1}_n \mathbf{1}_n^\top \otimes \mathbf{I}_p - \mathbf{I}_{np}] \tilde{\boldsymbol{\delta}} \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{2n^2} \text{tr} \left([\mathbf{1}_n \mathbf{1}_n^\top \otimes \mathbf{I}_p - \mathbf{I}_{np}] \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}} [\mathbf{1}_n \mathbf{1}_n^\top \otimes \mathbf{I}_p - \mathbf{I}_{np}] \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}} \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{2n^2} \sum_{a \in \mathcal{M}} \sum_{b \in \mathcal{M}} [\text{tr}(\mathbf{1}_n^\top \mathbf{D}_a \mathbf{1}_n \mathbf{1}_n^\top \mathbf{D}_b \mathbf{1}_n) - 2 \text{tr}(\mathbf{1}_n^\top \mathbf{D}_a \mathbf{D}_b \mathbf{1}_n) + \text{tr}(\mathbf{D}_a \mathbf{D}_b)] \text{tr}(\mathbf{\Gamma}_{a,M} \mathbf{\Gamma}_{b,M}) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{a \in \mathcal{M}} \sum_{b \in \mathcal{M}} \left[\left(1 - \frac{|a|}{n}\right) \left(1 - \frac{|b|}{n}\right) - \frac{2}{n} \left(1 - \frac{|a|}{n}\right) \wedge \left(1 - \frac{|b|}{n}\right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{1}{n} \left(1 - \frac{|a|}{n}\right) \mathbf{1}_{\{a=b\}} \right] \text{tr}(\mathbf{\Gamma}_{a,M} \mathbf{\Gamma}_{b,M}). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\text{Var}(T_n^{(G)}) = \frac{1}{2} \text{tr}(\mathbf{\Omega}_{n,M}^2)(1 + o(1)), \quad (12)$$

where $\mathbf{\Omega}_{n,M} = \mathbf{\Gamma}_{0,M} + 2 \sum_{h=1}^M (1 - \frac{h}{n}) \mathbf{\Gamma}_{h,M}$. Now, it suffices to prove

$$\frac{n \bar{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_n^\top \bar{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_n - \text{tr}(\mathbf{\Omega}_{n,M})}{\sqrt{2 \text{tr}(\mathbf{\Omega}_{n,M}^2)}} \xrightarrow{d} N(0, 1), \quad \frac{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n \boldsymbol{\delta}_t^\top \boldsymbol{\delta}_t - \text{tr}(\mathbf{\Gamma}_{0,M})}{\sqrt{2 \text{tr}(\mathbf{\Omega}_{n,M}^2)}} = o_p(1). \quad (13)$$

We will apply Theorem 3.1 in Ayyala et al. (2017) and its correction Theorem 2.1 in Cho et al. (2019) to prove the first part in equation (13). Before that, we rephrase Theorem 2.1 in Cho et al. (2019) with the notation in our paper as the following Proposition B.1.

Proposition B.1 (Cho et al. 2019, Theorem 2.1). *Let $\boldsymbol{\delta}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{\delta}_n \in \mathbb{R}^p$ follow an M -dependent strictly stationary Gaussian process with zero mean and autocovariance structure given by $\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_{0,M}, \dots, \boldsymbol{\Gamma}_{M,M}$. Assume that $p = O(n)$ and $p \rightarrow \infty$, $M = O(n^{1/8})$ and*

$$\text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_{a,M} \boldsymbol{\Gamma}_{b,M} \boldsymbol{\Gamma}_{c,M} \boldsymbol{\Gamma}_{d,M}) = o(M^{-4} \text{tr}^2(\boldsymbol{\Omega}_{n,M}^2)) \quad (14)$$

then as $n \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\frac{n \bar{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_n^\top \bar{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_n - \text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\Omega}_{n,M})}{\sqrt{2 \text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\Omega}_{n,M}^2)}} \xrightarrow{d} N(0, 1).$$

In order to utilize the above Proposition B.1, we only need to prove that the condition (14) holds. It suffices to prove that

$$\text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^4) = o(M^{-4} \text{tr}^2(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^2)).$$

Let $\lambda_1 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_p$ be the eigenvalues of $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$, by Assumption 2, we have $\lambda_1 \leq C_0$, and $\text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}) \geq pC_1$. Since $\text{tr}^2(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}) \leq p \text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^2)$, $M = \lceil \min(n, p)^{1/8} \rceil$, we have

$$\frac{M^4 \text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^4)}{\text{tr}^2(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^2)} \leq \frac{p^{1/2} \sum_{i=1}^p \lambda_i^4}{p^{-2} \text{tr}^4(\boldsymbol{\Sigma})} \leq \frac{p^{3/2} C_0^4}{p^2 C_1^4} = o(1).$$

Thus, the first part in equation (13) has been proved. Now, we prove the second part in equation (13).

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n \boldsymbol{\delta}_t^\top \boldsymbol{\delta}_t - \text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_{0,M}) \right)^2 \right] \\ &= \frac{2}{n^2} \sum_{a \in \mathcal{M}} \sum_{b \in \mathcal{M}} \text{tr}(\boldsymbol{D}_a \boldsymbol{D}_b) \text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_{a,M} \boldsymbol{\Gamma}_{b,M}) \\ &= \frac{2}{n} \sum_{h \in \mathcal{M}} \left(1 - \frac{h}{n} \right) \text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_{h,M}^2) = o(\text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\Omega}_{n,M}^2)). \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. ■

Lemma B.6. *Under Assumptions 1–3 and H_0 holds, as $\min(n, p) \rightarrow \infty$,*

$$\mathbb{E}[T_n^{(G)}] - \mu_n = o(\text{tr}^{1/2}(\boldsymbol{\Omega}_{n,M}^2)). \quad (15)$$

Proof By Lemma B.4, we have $\sum_{i=M}^{\infty} |b_i| = o(M^{-4})$, then, as $\min(n, p) \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbb{E}[T_n^{(G)}] - \mu_n| &= \left| \sum_{h=1}^M \frac{n-h}{n} \text{tr}(\mathbf{\Gamma}_h - \mathbf{\Gamma}_{h,M}) \right| = \text{tr}(\mathbf{\Sigma}) \left| \sum_{h=1}^M \frac{n-h}{n} \sum_{i=M+1}^{\infty} b_i b_{i-h} \right| \\ &\leq p^{1/2} \text{tr}^{1/2}(\mathbf{\Sigma}^2) \left(\sum_{i=M+1-h}^{\infty} |b_i| \right) \left(\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} |b_i| \right) \\ &= o\{p^{1/2} M^{-4} \text{tr}^{1/2}(\mathbf{\Sigma}^2)\} = o(\text{tr}^{1/2}(\mathbf{\Omega}_{n,M}^2)). \end{aligned}$$

■

B.1.2 Part 2

In this part, we will use the Gaussian approximation technique to prove the asymptotic normality of $T_n^{(NG)}$, which can be stated as the following Lemma B.7.

Lemma B.7. *Under Assumptions 1–3 and H_0 holds, as $n \rightarrow \infty$,*

$$T_n^{(G)} - T_n^{(NG)} = o_p(\text{tr}^{1/2}(\mathbf{\Omega}_{n,M}^2)).$$

Proof Since neither $\mathbf{\Gamma}_h$ nor $\mathbf{\Omega}_n$ appears in this part, we omit the subscript M from $\mathbf{\Gamma}_{h,M}$ and abbreviate $\mathbf{\Omega}_{n,M}$ as $\mathbf{\Omega}_n$ for simplicity. Define

$$\mathcal{F}_{ij}^{(G)} = n^{-1} [\boldsymbol{\delta}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\delta}_j - \text{tr}(\mathbf{\Gamma}_{|i-j|})].$$

For any n , choose $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and $C > 0$ and $\omega_n = Cn^\alpha > M$, so that $n = \omega_n q_n + r_n$. Then we can define the following random variables,

$$\begin{aligned} B_{ij}^{(G)} &= \sum_{k=(i-1)\omega_n+1}^{i\omega_n-M} \sum_{l=(j-1)\omega_n+1}^{j\omega_n-M} \mathcal{F}_{kl}^{(G)}, \\ D_{ij}^{(G)} &= \sum_{k=(i-1)\omega_n+1}^{i\omega_n} \sum_{l=(j-1)\omega_n+1}^{j\omega_n} \mathcal{F}_{kl}^{(G)} - B_{ij}^{(G)}, \\ F^{(G)} &= \sum_{(i,j) \in \{1, \dots, n\}^2 \setminus \{1, \dots, \omega_n q_n\}^2} \mathcal{F}_{ij}^{(G)}. \end{aligned}$$

For non-Gaussian sequence $\{\gamma_t\}_{t=1}^n$, we define $B_{ij}^{(NG)}, D_{ij}^{(NG)}, F^{(NG)}$, similarly. For the sake of simplicity, when we don't emphasize the difference between Gaussian

and non-Gaussian processes, we use the unmarked symbols B_{ij} to represent $B_{ij}^{(G)}$ or $B_{ij}^{(NG)}$. Let

$$S_1 = \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq q_n} B_{ij}, \quad S_2 = \sum_{i=1}^{q_n} \left(B_{ii} - \sum_{k=(i-1)\omega_n+1}^{i\omega_n-M} \mathcal{F}_{kk} \right)$$

$$S_3 = \sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq q_n} D_{ij} - \sum_{i=1}^{q_n} \sum_{k=i\omega_n-M+1}^{i\omega_n} \mathcal{F}_{kk}, \quad S_4 = F - \sum_{k=q_n\omega_n+1}^n \mathcal{F}_{kk},$$

and $\Delta S_i = S_i^{(G)} - S_i^{(NG)}$. Then, $T_n^{(G)} - T_n^{(NG)} = \Delta S_1 + \Delta S_2/2 + \Delta S_3/2 + \Delta S_4/2$. Now, it suffice to prove that $\Delta S_i = o_p(\text{tr}^{1/2}(\mathbf{\Omega}_{n,M}^2))$, which is presented in Lemmas B.8–B.11. \blacksquare

Lemma B.8. *Under Assumptions 1–3 and H_0 , as $n \rightarrow \infty$,*

$$\Delta S_1 = o_p(\text{tr}^{1/2}(\mathbf{\Omega}_{n,M}^2)). \quad (16)$$

Proof For $i = 1, \dots, q_n$, we define

$$\boldsymbol{\eta}_i = \frac{1}{\omega_n - M} \sum_{k=(i-1)\omega_n+1}^{i\omega_n-M} \boldsymbol{\delta}_k, \quad \boldsymbol{\xi}_i = \frac{1}{\omega_n - M} \sum_{k=(i-1)\omega_n+1}^{i\omega_n-M} \boldsymbol{\gamma}_k.$$

Since $\{\boldsymbol{\eta}_i\}_{i=1}^{q_n}$ and $\{\boldsymbol{\xi}_i\}_{i=1}^{q_n}$ are both independent series, for any $i \neq j$,

$$B_{ij}^{(G)} = \frac{(\omega_n - M)^2}{n} \boldsymbol{\eta}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\eta}_j, \quad B_{ij}^{(NG)} = \frac{(\omega_n - M)^2}{n} \boldsymbol{\xi}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\xi}_j.$$

Define $\nu_n(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \frac{(\omega_n - M)^2}{n \text{tr}^{1/2}(\mathbf{\Omega}_{n,M}^2)} \mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{y}$, and

$$W(\boldsymbol{\eta}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{\eta}_{q_n}) = \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq q_n} B_{ij}^{(G)} / \text{tr}^{1/2}(\mathbf{\Omega}_{n,M}^2) = \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq q_n} \nu_n(\boldsymbol{\eta}_i, \boldsymbol{\eta}_j),$$

$$W(\boldsymbol{\xi}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{\xi}_{q_n}) = \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq q_n} B_{ij}^{(NG)} / \text{tr}^{1/2}(\mathbf{\Omega}_{n,M}^2) = \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq q_n} \nu_n(\boldsymbol{\xi}_i, \boldsymbol{\xi}_j).$$

By Pollard (2012), It is known that a sequence of random variables $\{Z_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ converges weekly to a random variable Z if and only if for every $f \in \mathcal{C}_b^3(\mathbb{R})$, $\mathbb{E}(f(Z_n)) \rightarrow \mathbb{E}(f(Z))$. Thus, it is necessary to prove $|\mathbb{E}[f(W(\boldsymbol{\xi}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{\xi}_{q_n}))] - \mathbb{E}[f(W(\boldsymbol{\eta}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{\eta}_{q_n}))]| \rightarrow 0$. Since both $\boldsymbol{\eta}_i$ and $\boldsymbol{\xi}_i$ are finite linear combination of $Z_{i,j}$, it's easy to check that

$\{\boldsymbol{\eta}_i\}_{i=1}^{q_n}$ and $\{\boldsymbol{\xi}_i\}_{i=1}^{q_n}$ satisfy the following Proportions B.2–B.3. For $k = 1, \dots, q_n + 1$, we further define

$$\begin{aligned} W_k &= W(\boldsymbol{\eta}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{\eta}_{k-1}, \boldsymbol{\xi}_k, \dots, \boldsymbol{\xi}_{q_n}), \\ W_{k,0} &= \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq k-1} \nu_n(\boldsymbol{\eta}_i, \boldsymbol{\eta}_j) + \sum_{k+1 \leq i < j \leq q_n} \nu_n(\boldsymbol{\xi}_i, \boldsymbol{\xi}_j) + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq k-1} \sum_{k+1 \leq j \leq q_n} \nu_n(\boldsymbol{\eta}_i, \boldsymbol{\xi}_j). \end{aligned}$$

For a fixed function $f \in \mathcal{C}_b^3(\mathbb{R})$, we have

$$|\mathbb{E}[f(W(\boldsymbol{\xi}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{\xi}_{q_n}))] - \mathbb{E}[f(W(\boldsymbol{\eta}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{\eta}_{q_n}))]| \leq \sum_{k=1}^{q_n} |\mathbb{E}f(W_k) - \mathbb{E}f(W_{k+1})|.$$

By Taylor's expansion,

$$\begin{aligned} \left| f(W_k) - f(W_{k,0}) - \sum_{i=1}^2 \frac{1}{i!} (W_k - W_{k,0})^i f^{(i)}(W_{k,0}) \right| &\leq \frac{\sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} |f^{(3)}(x)|}{6} |W_k - W_{k,0}|^3, \\ \left| f(W_{k+1}) - f(W_{k,0}) - \sum_{i=1}^2 \frac{1}{i!} (W_{k+1} - W_{k,0})^i f^{(i)}(W_{k,0}) \right| &\leq \frac{\sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} |f^{(3)}(x)|}{6} |W_{k+1} - W_{k,0}|^3. \end{aligned}$$

We have

$$\mathbb{E}[W_k - W_{k,0} | \boldsymbol{\eta}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{\eta}_{k-1}, \boldsymbol{\xi}_{k+1}, \dots, \boldsymbol{\xi}_{q_n}] = \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \mathbb{E}[\nu_n(\boldsymbol{\eta}_i, \boldsymbol{\xi}_k) | \boldsymbol{\eta}_i] + \sum_{j=k+1}^{q_n} \mathbb{E}[\nu_n(\boldsymbol{\xi}_k, \boldsymbol{\xi}_j) | \boldsymbol{\xi}_j] = 0.$$

Similarly, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[W_{k+1} - W_{k,0} | \boldsymbol{\eta}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{\eta}_{k-1}, \boldsymbol{\xi}_{k+1}, \dots, \boldsymbol{\xi}_{q_n}] = 0.$$

Using the similar method, we can prove that

$$\mathbb{E}[(W_k - W_{k,0})^2 | \boldsymbol{\eta}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{\eta}_{k-1}, \boldsymbol{\xi}_{k+1}, \dots, \boldsymbol{\xi}_{q_n}] = \mathbb{E}[(W_{k+1} - W_{k,0})^2 | \boldsymbol{\eta}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{\eta}_{k-1}, \boldsymbol{\xi}_{k+1}, \dots, \boldsymbol{\xi}_{q_n}].$$

Thus,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i=1}^2 \frac{1}{i!} (W_k - W_{k,0})^i f^{(i)}(W_{k,0}) \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i=1}^2 \frac{1}{i!} (W_{k+1} - W_{k,0})^i f^{(i)}(W_{k,0}) \right].$$

Then we have

$$|\mathbb{E}f(W(\boldsymbol{\xi}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{\xi}_{q_n})) - \mathbb{E}f(W(\boldsymbol{\eta}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{\eta}_{q_n}))| \leq \sum_{k=1}^{q_n} |\mathbb{E}f(W_k) - \mathbb{E}f(W_{k+1})|$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \sum_{k=1}^{q_n} \frac{\sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} |f^{(3)}(x)|}{6} (\mathbb{E} |W_k - W_{k,0}|^3 + \mathbb{E} |W_{k+1} - W_{k,0}|^3) \\
&\leq \sum_{k=1}^{q_n} \frac{\sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} |f^{(3)}(x)|}{6} \left\{ [\mathbb{E} |W_k - W_{k,0}|^4]^{3/4} + [\mathbb{E} |W_{k+1} - W_{k,0}|^4]^{3/4} \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Now we derive upper bounds for $\mathbb{E} |W_k - W_{k,0}|^4$ and $\mathbb{E} |W_{k+1} - W_{k,0}|^4$, by Proposition B.2, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E} |W_k - W_{k,0}|^4 \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \mathbb{E} [\nu_n(\boldsymbol{\eta}_i, \boldsymbol{\xi}_k)^4] + \sum_{j=k+1}^{q_n} \mathbb{E} [\nu_n(\boldsymbol{\xi}_k, \boldsymbol{\xi}_j)^4] + 6 \sum_{i_1=1}^{k-1} \sum_{i_2=i_1+1}^{k-1} \mathbb{E} [\nu_n(\boldsymbol{\eta}_{i_1}, \boldsymbol{\xi}_k)^2 \nu_n(\boldsymbol{\eta}_{i_2}, \boldsymbol{\xi}_k)^2] \\
&\quad + 6 \sum_{j_1=k+1}^{q_n} \sum_{j_2=j_1+1}^{q_n} \mathbb{E} [\nu_n(\boldsymbol{\xi}_k, \boldsymbol{\xi}_{j_1})^2 \nu_n(\boldsymbol{\xi}_k, \boldsymbol{\xi}_{j_2})^2] + 6 \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \sum_{j=k+1}^{q_n} \mathbb{E} [\nu_n(\boldsymbol{\eta}_i, \boldsymbol{\xi}_k)^2 \nu_n(\boldsymbol{\xi}_k, \boldsymbol{\xi}_j)^2] \\
&\leq \rho \left(\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \phi_{i,k}^4 + \sum_{j=k+1}^{q_n} \phi_{k,j}^4 + 6 \sum_{i_1=1}^{k-1} \sum_{i_2=i_1+1}^{k-1} \phi_{i_1,k}^2 \phi_{i_2,k}^2 + 6 \sum_{j_1=k+1}^{q_n} \sum_{j_2=j_1+1}^{q_n} \phi_{k,j_1}^2 \phi_{k,j_2}^2 + 6 \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \sum_{j=k+1}^{q_n} \phi_{i,k}^2 \phi_{k,j}^2 \right) \\
&\leq 3\rho \left(\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \phi_{i,k}^2 + \sum_{j=k+1}^{q_n} \phi_{k,j}^2 \right)^2 = 3\rho \text{Inf}_k^2,
\end{aligned}$$

where $\text{Inf}_k = \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \phi_{i,k}^2 + \sum_{j=k+1}^{q_n} \phi_{k,j}^2$. Similarly, we have $\mathbb{E} |W_{k+1} - W_{k,0}|^4 \leq 3\rho \text{Inf}_k^2$. Thus,

$$|\mathbb{E} f(W(\boldsymbol{\xi}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{\xi}_{q_n})) - \mathbb{E} f(W(\boldsymbol{\eta}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{\eta}_{q_n}))| = O\left(\sum_{k=1}^{q_n} \text{Inf}_k^{3/2}\right).$$

Since $\boldsymbol{\xi}_i$ has the same first two moment as $\boldsymbol{\eta}_i$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\phi_{i,j}^2 &= \mathbb{E} [\nu_n(\boldsymbol{\xi}_i, \boldsymbol{\xi}_j)^2] = \frac{(\omega_n - M)^4}{n^2 \text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\Omega}_{n,M}^2)} \mathbb{E} [\boldsymbol{\xi}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\xi}_j \boldsymbol{\xi}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\xi}_j] \\
&= \frac{1}{n^2 \text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\Omega}_n^2)} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{k_1=(i-1)\omega_n+1}^{i\omega_n-M} \sum_{l_1=(j-1)\omega_n+1}^{j\omega_n-M} \sum_{k_2=(i-1)\omega_n+1}^{i\omega_n-M} \sum_{l_2=(j-1)\omega_n+1}^{j\omega_n-M} \boldsymbol{\gamma}_{k_1}^\top \boldsymbol{\gamma}_{l_1} \boldsymbol{\gamma}_{k_2}^\top \boldsymbol{\gamma}_{l_2} \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{n^2 \text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\Omega}_n^2)} \text{tr} \left[\left(\sum_{k_1=(i-1)\omega_n+1}^{i\omega_n-M} \sum_{k_2=(i-1)\omega_n+1}^{i\omega_n-M} \boldsymbol{\Gamma}_{k_1-k_2} \right)^2 \right]
\end{aligned}$$

$$= \frac{(\omega_n - M)^2}{n^2} \cdot \frac{\text{tr}(\mathbf{\Omega}_{\omega_n - M, M}^2)}{\text{tr}(\mathbf{\Omega}_{n, M}^2)} \{1 + o(1)\}.$$

Then we have

$$\sum_{k=1}^{q_n} \text{Inf}_k^{3/2} = O \left[q_n \left\{ \frac{(q_n - 1)(\omega_n - M)^2 \text{tr}(\mathbf{\Omega}_{\omega_n - M, M}^2)}{n^2 \text{tr}(\mathbf{\Omega}_{n, M}^2)} \right\}^{3/2} \right] = o(1).$$

This completes the proof of Lemma B.8. \blacksquare

Proportion B.2. For $1 \leq i \leq q_n$,

- For any $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{R}^p$, $\mathbb{E}[\nu_n(\boldsymbol{\xi}_i, \mathbf{a})] = \mathbb{E}[\nu_n(\mathbf{a}, \boldsymbol{\xi}_i)] = \mathbb{E}[\nu_n(\boldsymbol{\eta}_i, \mathbf{a})] = \mathbb{E}[\nu_n(\mathbf{a}, \boldsymbol{\eta}_i)] = 0$.
- For any $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^p$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\nu_n(\mathbf{a}, \boldsymbol{\xi}_i) \nu_n(\mathbf{b}, \boldsymbol{\xi}_i)] &= \mathbb{E}[\nu_n(\mathbf{a}, \boldsymbol{\eta}_i) \nu_n(\mathbf{b}, \boldsymbol{\eta}_i)], \\ \mathbb{E}[\nu_n(\mathbf{a}, \boldsymbol{\xi}_i) \nu_n(\boldsymbol{\xi}_i, \mathbf{b})] &= \mathbb{E}[\nu_n(\mathbf{a}, \boldsymbol{\eta}_i) \nu_n(\boldsymbol{\eta}_i, \mathbf{b})], \\ \mathbb{E}[\nu_n(\boldsymbol{\xi}_i, \mathbf{a}) \nu_n(\boldsymbol{\xi}_i, \mathbf{b})] &= \mathbb{E}[\nu_n(\boldsymbol{\eta}_i, \mathbf{a}) \nu_n(\boldsymbol{\eta}_i, \mathbf{b})]. \end{aligned}$$

Proportion B.3. For $1 \leq i < j \leq q_n$, let $\phi_{i,j}^2 = \mathbb{E}[\nu_n(\boldsymbol{\xi}_i, \boldsymbol{\xi}_j)^2]$, and $\rho_0 = \max\{\tau_1, 3\}$. Under Assumptions 1–3,

$$\max \{ \mathbb{E}[\nu_n(\boldsymbol{\xi}_i, \boldsymbol{\xi}_j)^4], \mathbb{E}[\nu_n(\boldsymbol{\xi}_i, \boldsymbol{\eta}_j)^4], \mathbb{E}[\nu_n(\boldsymbol{\eta}_i, \boldsymbol{\xi}_j)^4], \mathbb{E}[\nu_n(\boldsymbol{\eta}_i, \boldsymbol{\eta}_j)^4] \} \leq \rho_0 \phi_{i,j}^4$$

Proof Let a_i be the coefficient of $\mathbf{Z}_{t\omega_n - M - i}$ in $\boldsymbol{\xi}_t$. By Lemma B.1, for any semi-positive definite matrix \mathbf{B} , we have

$$\mathbb{E}[(\boldsymbol{\xi}_t^\top \mathbf{B} \boldsymbol{\xi}_t)^2] \leq \tau_1 (\mathbb{E}[\boldsymbol{\xi}_t^\top \mathbf{B} \boldsymbol{\xi}_t])^2,$$

where τ is a constant. It follows that,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[(\boldsymbol{\xi}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\xi}_j)^4] &= \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[(\boldsymbol{\xi}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\xi}_j \boldsymbol{\xi}_j^\top \boldsymbol{\xi}_i)^2 | \boldsymbol{\xi}_j]] \\ &\leq \tau_1 \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[(\boldsymbol{\xi}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\xi}_j \boldsymbol{\xi}_j^\top \boldsymbol{\xi}_i) | \boldsymbol{\xi}_j]^2] \\ &= \tau_1 \mathbb{E}[(\boldsymbol{\xi}_j^\top \mathbb{E}[\boldsymbol{\xi}_i \boldsymbol{\xi}_i^\top] \boldsymbol{\xi}_j)^2] = \tau_1 \mathbb{E}^2[(\boldsymbol{\xi}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\xi}_j)^2]. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\{\boldsymbol{\eta}_i\}$ is i.i.d. Gaussian distributed random vector sequence, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[(\boldsymbol{\eta}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\eta}_j)^4] &= \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[(\boldsymbol{\eta}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\eta}_j \boldsymbol{\eta}_j^\top \boldsymbol{\eta}_i)^2 | \boldsymbol{\eta}_j]] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[2 \text{tr}((\mathbb{E}[\boldsymbol{\eta}_i \boldsymbol{\eta}_i^\top] \boldsymbol{\eta}_j \boldsymbol{\eta}_j^\top)^2) + (\text{tr}(\mathbb{E}[\boldsymbol{\eta}_i \boldsymbol{\eta}_i^\top] \boldsymbol{\eta}_j \boldsymbol{\eta}_j^\top))^2 \right] \\ &= 3 \mathbb{E}[(\boldsymbol{\eta}_j^\top \mathbb{E}[\boldsymbol{\eta}_i \boldsymbol{\eta}_i^\top] \boldsymbol{\eta}_j)^2] = 3 \mathbb{E}[(\boldsymbol{\eta}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\eta}_j)^2] \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we have $\mathbb{E}[(\boldsymbol{\eta}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\xi}_j)^4] \leq \tau_1 \mathbb{E}[(\boldsymbol{\eta}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\xi}_j)^2]$ and $\mathbb{E}[(\boldsymbol{\xi}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\eta}_j)^4] \leq \tau_1 \mathbb{E}[(\boldsymbol{\xi}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\eta}_j)^2]$, which completes the proof of Proportion B.3. \blacksquare

Lemma B.9. *Under Assumptions 1–3 and H_0 holds, as $n \rightarrow \infty$,*

$$\Delta S_2 = o_p(\text{tr}^{1/2}(\mathbf{\Omega}_{n,M}^2)). \quad (17)$$

Proof We only need to prove

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^{q_n} \sum_{(i-1)\omega_n+1 \leq k < l \leq i\omega_n-M} \mathcal{F}_{kl}^{(G)} &= o_p(\text{tr}^{1/2}(\mathbf{\Omega}_{n,M}^2)), \\ \sum_{i=1}^{q_n} \sum_{(i-1)\omega_n+1 \leq k < l \leq i\omega_n-M} \mathcal{F}_{kl}^{(NG)} &= o_p(\text{tr}^{1/2}(\mathbf{\Omega}_{n,M}^2)). \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

Note that, $\{\sum_{(i-1)\omega_n+1 \leq k < l \leq i\omega_n-M} \mathcal{F}_{kl}\}_{i=1}^{q_n}$ are independent identically distributed sequence, and $\sum_{1 \leq k < l \leq \omega_n-M} \mathcal{F}_{kl}^{(G)} = T_{\omega_n-M}^{(G)} - \mathbb{E}[T_{\omega_n-M}^{(G)}]$. Replace n in (12) with $\omega_n - M$, we have

$$\text{Var} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{q_n} \sum_{(i-1)\omega_n+1 \leq k < l \leq i\omega_n-M} [\delta_k^\top \delta_l - \text{tr}(\mathbf{\Gamma}_{k-l,M})] \right) = \frac{q_n(\omega_n - M)^2}{2} \text{tr}(\mathbf{\Omega}_{\omega_n-M,M}^2) (1+o(1)).$$

Then

$$\frac{q_n(\omega_n - M) \text{tr}(\mathbf{\Omega}_{\omega_n-M,M}^2) (1+o(1))}{2n^2 \text{tr}(\mathbf{\Omega}_{n,M}^2)} = o(1),$$

which implies the first equation of (18). Now, we consider the second equation of (18). Let $k_{(1)} < \dots < k_{(4)}$ be the sorted value of k_1, k_2, k_3, k_4 , and $d_i = k_{(i+1)} - k_{(i)}$. Define $\mathcal{A} = \{(k_1, k_2, k_3, k_4) : 1 \leq k_1 \neq k_2 \leq \omega_n - M; 1 \leq k_3 \neq k_4 \leq \omega_n - M\}$, $\mathcal{A}_1 = \{d_1 > M \text{ or } d_3 > M\}$, $\mathcal{A}_2 = \{d_1 \leq M, d_3 \leq M, d_2 > M\}$, $\mathcal{A}_3 = \{d_i \leq M, i = 1, 2, 3\}$. We partition \mathcal{A}_2 into $\mathcal{A}_{2,1} = \mathcal{A}_2 \cap \{|k_1 - k_2| \leq M, |k_3 - k_4| \leq M\}$, and $\mathcal{A}_{2,2} = \mathcal{A}_2 \setminus \mathcal{A}_{2,1}$. For any $(k_1, \dots, k_4) \in \mathcal{A}_1$, $\mathbb{E}(\mathcal{F}_{k_1, k_2} \mathcal{F}_{k_3, k_4}) = 0$, and any $(k_1, \dots, k_4) \in \mathcal{A}_{2,1}$, $\mathbb{E}(\mathcal{F}_{k_1 k_2} \mathcal{F}_{k_3 k_4}) = \mathbb{E}(\mathcal{F}_{k_1 k_2}) \mathbb{E}(\mathcal{F}_{k_3 k_4}) = 0$. Then we only need to check $\mathcal{A}_{2,2}$ and \mathcal{A}_3 . Since $|\mathcal{A}_{2,2}| \leq 10\omega_n^2 M^2$ and $|\mathcal{A}_3| \leq 24\omega_n M^3$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{Var} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{q_n} \sum_{(i-1)\omega_n+1 \leq k < l \leq i\omega_n-M} [\gamma_k^\top \gamma_l - \text{tr}(\mathbf{\Gamma}_{k-l,M})] \right) \\ &= \frac{q_n}{4} \left| \sum_{(k_1, \dots, k_4) \in \mathcal{A}} \mathbb{E}[\{\gamma_{k_1}^\top \gamma_{k_2} - \text{tr}(\mathbf{\Gamma}_{k_1-k_2,M})\} \{\gamma_{k_3}^\top \gamma_{k_4} - \text{tr}(\mathbf{\Gamma}_{k_3-k_4,M})\}] \right| \\ &= \frac{n^2 q_n}{4} \left| \left(\sum_{(k_1, \dots, k_4) \in \mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{A}_1} + \sum_{(k_1, \dots, k_4) \in \mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{A}_2} + \sum_{(k_1, \dots, k_4) \in \mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{A}_3} \right) \mathbb{E}(\mathcal{F}_{k_1 k_2} \mathcal{F}_{k_3 k_4}) \right| \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \frac{n^2 q_n}{4} \left| \sum_{(k_1, \dots, k_4) \in \mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{A}_{2,2}} \mathbb{E}(\mathcal{F}_{k_1 k_2} \mathcal{F}_{k_3 k_4}) + \sum_{(k_1, \dots, k_4) \in \mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{A}_3} \mathbb{E}(\mathcal{F}_{k_1 k_2} \mathcal{F}_{k_3 k_4}) \right| \\
&= O \left\{ (10\omega_n^2 M^2 + 24\omega_n M^3) q_n \operatorname{tr}(\mathbf{\Omega}_{n,M}^2) \right\} \\
&= o(n^2 \operatorname{tr}(\mathbf{\Omega}_{n,M}^2)).
\end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. ■

Lemma B.10. *Under Assumptions 1–3 and H_0 holds, as $n \rightarrow \infty$,*

$$\Delta S_3 = o_p(\operatorname{tr}^{1/2}(\mathbf{\Omega}_{n,M}^2)).$$

Proof We partition ΔS_3 into

$$\Delta S_{3,1} = \sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq q_n} D_{ij}^{(G)} - \sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq q_n} D_{ij}^{(NG)}, \quad \Delta S_{3,2} = \sum_{j=1}^{q_n} \sum_{i=j\omega_n-M+1}^{j\omega_n} \mathcal{F}_{ii}.$$

It's easy to prove that $\Delta S_{3,2} = o_p(\operatorname{tr}^{1/2}(\mathbf{\Omega}_{n,M}^2))$. We will focus on $\Delta S_{3,1}$. Define

$$\begin{aligned}
L_{ij} &= \sum_{k=i\omega_n-M+1}^{i\omega_n} \sum_{l=(j-1)\omega_n+1}^{j\omega_n-M} \mathcal{F}_{kl}, \\
R_{ij} &= \sum_{k=(i-1)\omega_n+1}^{i\omega_n-M} \sum_{l=j\omega_n-M+1}^{j\omega_n} \mathcal{F}_{kl}, \\
C_{ij} &= \sum_{k=i\omega_n-M+1}^{i\omega_n} \sum_{l=j\omega_n-M+1}^{j\omega_n} \mathcal{F}_{kl}.
\end{aligned}$$

Then, $D_{ij} = L_{ij} + R_{ij} + C_{ij}$. Since $\mathcal{F}_{kl} = \mathcal{F}_{lk}$, we can find out that $R_{ij} = L_{ji}$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
S_{3,1} &= \sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq q_n} 2L_{ij} + \sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq q_n} C_{ij} \\
&= 2 \left(\sum_{i=1}^{q_n-1} \sum_{j=i+2}^{q_n} + \sum_{i=2}^{q_n} \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \right) L_{ij} + \sum_{i=1}^{q_n} L_{ii} + \sum_{i=1}^{q_n-1} L_{i,i+1} + \left(2 \sum_{i=1}^{q_n} \sum_{j=i+1}^{q_n} + \sum_{i=1}^{q_n} \right) C_{ij} \\
&= 2\mathcal{L}_1 + 2\mathcal{L}_2 + 2\mathcal{L}_3 + 2\mathcal{L}_4 + 2\mathcal{C}_1 + \mathcal{C}_2,
\end{aligned}$$

where $\mathcal{L}_1 = \sum_{i=1}^{q_n-1} \sum_{j=i+2}^{q_n} L_{ij}^{(G)}$, $\mathcal{L}_2 = \sum_{i=2}^{q_n} \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} L_{ij}^{(G)}$, $\mathcal{L}_3 = \sum_{i=1}^{q_n} L_{ii}^{(G)}$, $\mathcal{L}_4 = \sum_{i=1}^{q_n-1} L_{i,i+1}^{(G)}$, $\mathcal{C}_1 = \sum_{i=1}^{q_n} \sum_{j=i+1}^{q_n} C_{ij}^{(G)}$, $\mathcal{C}_2 = \sum_{i=1}^{q_n} C_{ij}^{(G)}$.

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}[(\mathcal{L}_1^{(NG)})^2] \\
&= \sum_{i_1=1}^{q_n-1} \sum_{j_1=i_1+2}^{q_n} \sum_{i_2=1}^{q_n-1} \sum_{j_2=i_2+2}^{q_n} \sum_{k_1=i_1\omega_n-M+1}^{i_1\omega_n} \sum_{k_2=(j_1-1)\omega_n+1}^{j_1\omega_n-M} \sum_{k_3=i_2\omega_n-M+1}^{i_2\omega_n} \sum_{k_4=(j_2-1)\omega_n+1}^{j_2\omega_n-M} \mathbb{E}(\gamma_{k_1}^\top \gamma_{k_2} \gamma_{k_3}^\top \gamma_{k_4}) \\
&= n^{-2} \sum_{i=1}^{q_n-1} \sum_{j=i+2}^{q_n} \mathbb{E} \left[\left\{ \left(\sum_{k=i\omega_n-M+1}^{i\omega_n} \gamma_k \right)^\top \left(\sum_{l=(j-1)\omega_n+1}^{j\omega_n-M} \gamma_l \right) \right\}^2 \right] \\
&= n^{-2} (q_n - 1)(q_n - 2)M(\omega_n - M) \text{tr}(\mathbf{\Omega}_{M,M} \mathbf{\Omega}_{\omega_n-M,M}) \\
&\leq n^{-2} (q_n - 1)M[(q_n - 2)(\omega_n - M)] \text{tr}^{1/2}(\mathbf{\Omega}_{M,M}^2) \text{tr}^{1/2}(\mathbf{\Omega}_{\omega_n-M,M}^2) \\
&= O(n^{-1} q_n M \text{tr}(\mathbf{\Omega}_{n,M}^2)) = o(\text{tr}(\mathbf{\Omega}_{n,M}^2)),
\end{aligned}$$

the second equation holds due to the following fact. Firstly, $\mathbb{E}(\gamma_{k_1}^\top \gamma_{k_2} \gamma_{k_3}^\top \gamma_{k_4}) \neq 0$ only if $k_{(2)} - k_{(1)} \leq M$ and $k_{(4)} - k_{(3)} \leq M$, where $k_{(1)} < \dots < k_{(4)}$ be the sorted k_1, \dots, k_4 . Now, we consider the terms in the second equation. Note that $j_1 \geq i_1 + 2$ and $j_2 \geq i_2 + 2$, then $k_2 - k_1 > M$ and $k_4 - k_3 > M$. Thus, $\mathbb{E}(\gamma_{k_1}^\top \gamma_{k_2} \gamma_{k_3}^\top \gamma_{k_4}) \neq 0$ only if $i_1 = i_2$ or $i_1 = j_2$ or $i_1 = j_2 - 1$. When $i_1 = i_2$, $\mathbb{E}(\gamma_{k_1}^\top \gamma_{k_2} \gamma_{k_3}^\top \gamma_{k_4}) \neq 0$ only if $j_1 = j_2$. When $i_1 = j_2$ or $i_1 = j_2 - 1$, then $i_2 \leq j_2 - 2 \leq i_1 - 1$, which implies $k_{(2)} - k_{(1)} = \min\{k_1 - k_3, k_4 - k_3\} > M$. Therefore, $\mathbb{E}(\gamma_{k_1}^\top \gamma_{k_2} \gamma_{k_3}^\top \gamma_{k_4}) \neq 0$ only if $i_1 = i_2$ and $j_1 = j_2$. Now, we have proved $\mathcal{L}_1^{(NG)} = o(\text{tr}^{1/2}(\mathbf{\Omega}_{n,M}^2))$. Similarly, we can prove that $\mathcal{L}_2^{(NG)} = o(\text{tr}^{1/2}(\mathbf{\Omega}_{n,M}^2))$, $\mathcal{L}_2^{(G)} = o(\text{tr}^{1/2}(\mathbf{\Omega}_{n,M}^2))$, $\mathcal{L}_2^{(G)} = o(\text{tr}^{1/2}(\mathbf{\Omega}_{n,M}^2))$, $\mathcal{C}_1^{(NG)} = o(\text{tr}^{1/2}(\mathbf{\Omega}_{n,M}^2))$ and $\mathcal{C}_1^{(G)} = o(\text{tr}^{1/2}(\mathbf{\Omega}_{n,M}^2))$.

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[(\mathcal{L}_3^{(NG)})^2] &= \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{i=1}^{q_n} \sum_{k=i\omega_n-M+1}^{i\omega_n} \sum_{l=(i-1)\omega_n+1}^{i\omega_n-M} \mathcal{F}_{kl}^{(NG)} \right)^2 \right] \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^{q_n} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{k=i\omega_n-M+1}^{i\omega_n} \sum_{l=(i-1)\omega_n+1}^{i\omega_n-M} \mathcal{F}_{kl}^{(NG)} \right)^2 \right] \\
&= O(n^{-2} q_n (\omega_n - M)^2 M^2 \text{tr}(\mathbf{\Omega}_{n,M}^2)) = o(\text{tr}(\mathbf{\Omega}_{n,M}^2)).
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we can prove that $\mathcal{L}_4^{(NG)} = o(\text{tr}^{1/2}(\mathbf{\Omega}_{n,M}^2))$, $\mathcal{L}_3^{(G)} = o(\text{tr}^{1/2}(\mathbf{\Omega}_{n,M}^2))$, $\mathcal{L}_4^{(G)} = o(\text{tr}^{1/2}(\mathbf{\Omega}_{n,M}^2))$, $\mathcal{C}_2^{(NG)} = o(\text{tr}^{1/2}(\mathbf{\Omega}_{n,M}^2))$ and $\mathcal{C}_2^{(G)} = o(\text{tr}^{1/2}(\mathbf{\Omega}_{n,M}^2))$. This completes the proof. \blacksquare

Lemma B.11. *Under Assumptions 1–3 and H_0 holds, as $n \rightarrow \infty$,*

$$\Delta S_4 = o_p(\text{tr}^{1/2}(\mathbf{\Omega}_{n,M}^2)).$$

Proof We partition

$$\Delta S_4 = F^{(G)} - F^{(NG)} + \sum_{k=q_n\omega_n+1}^n \mathcal{F}_{kk}^{(NG)} - \sum_{k=q_n\omega_n+1}^n \mathcal{F}_{kk}^{(G)} \triangleq \Delta S_{4,1} + \Delta S_{4,2}.$$

Since $\Delta S_{4,2} = o_p(\text{tr}^{1/2}(\mathbf{\Omega}_{n,M}^2))$ is trivial, it suffices to prove $\Delta S_{4,1} = o_p(\text{tr}^{1/2}(\mathbf{\Omega}_{n,M}^2))$. Define

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{B} &= \{(k_1, k_2, k_3, k_4) \in \{1, \dots, n\} \times \{q_n\omega_n + 1, \dots, n\} \times \{1, \dots, n\} \times \{q_n\omega_n + 1, \dots, n\}\}, \\ \mathcal{B}_1 &= \{(k_1, k_2, k_3, k_4) \in \{1, \dots, n\}^4 : |k_1 - k_3| \geq 3M; \min(k_1, k_3) > q_n\omega_n\}, \\ \mathcal{B}_2 &= \{(k_1, k_2, k_3, k_4) \in \{1, \dots, n\}^4 : |k_1 - k_3| \geq 3M; \min(k_1, k_3) > q_n\omega_n; \\ &\quad \min(|k_1 - k_2|, |k_1 - k_4|) \leq M; \min(|k_3 - k_2|, |k_3 - k_4|) \leq M\}. \end{aligned}$$

For any $(k_1, k_2, k_3, k_4) \in \mathcal{B}_1 \setminus \mathcal{B}_2$, we have $\mathbb{E}(\mathcal{F}_{k_1 k_2} \mathcal{F}_{k_3 k_4}) = 0$. Note that $\mathcal{B}_2 \subset \{q_n\omega_n + 1, \dots, n\}^4$, then $|\mathcal{A}_2| \leq r_n^4$. Since $|\mathcal{B} \setminus \mathcal{B}_1| \leq 6Mn\omega_n^2$, by Corollary B.3, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[(F^{(NG)})^2] &= \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\sum_{k=1}^n \sum_{l=q_n\omega_n+1}^n \mathcal{F}_{kl} + \sum_{k=q_n\omega_n+1}^n \sum_{l=1}^n \mathcal{F}_{kl}\right)^2\right] \\ &\leq 4 \sum_{k=1}^n \sum_{l=q_n\omega_n+1}^n \sum_{r=1}^n \sum_{s=q_n\omega_n+1}^n |\mathbb{E}(\mathcal{F}_{kl} \mathcal{F}_{rs})| \\ &= 4 \sum_{(k,l,r,s) \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \mathcal{A}_1} |\mathbb{E}(\mathcal{F}_{kl} \mathcal{F}_{rs})| + 4 \sum_{(k,l,r,s) \in \mathcal{A}_2} |\mathbb{E}(\mathcal{F}_{kl} \mathcal{F}_{rs})| \\ &= O\left\{\frac{6Mn\omega_n^2 + r_n^4}{n^2} \text{tr}(\mathbf{\Omega}_{n,M}^2)\right\} = o(\text{tr}(\mathbf{\Omega}_{n,M}^2)). \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we have $\mathbb{E}[(F^{(G)})^2] = o(\text{tr}(\mathbf{\Omega}_{n,M}^2))$. This completes the proof. ■

B.1.3 Part 3

Lemma B.12. *Under Assumptions 1–3 and H_0 holds, as $n \rightarrow \infty$,*

$$T_n - T_n^{(NG)} = o_p(\text{tr}^{1/2}(\mathbf{\Omega}_{n,M}^2)).$$

Proof We reformulate

$$\begin{aligned}
T_n - T_n^{(NG)} &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=2}^n \sum_{s=1}^{t-1} (\epsilon_t^\top \epsilon_s - \gamma_t^\top \gamma_s) \\
&= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=2}^n \sum_{s=1}^{t-1} (\epsilon_t - \gamma_t)^\top (\epsilon_s - \gamma_s) + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{1 \leq t, s \leq n, t \neq s} \gamma_t^\top (\epsilon_s - \gamma_s).
\end{aligned}$$

By the calculations, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\text{Var} \left\{ \sum_{1 \leq t, s \leq n, t \neq s} \gamma_t^\top (\epsilon_s - \gamma_s) \right\} \\
&= \sum_{\substack{1 \leq t_1, t_2, s_1, s_2 \leq n \\ t_1 \neq s_1, t_2 \neq s_2}} \sum_{\substack{t_1 - M \leq u_1 \leq t_1 \\ t_2 - M \leq u_2 \leq t_2}} \sum_{\substack{v_1 \leq s_1 - M - 1 \\ v_2 \leq s_2 - M - 1}} b_{t_1 - u_1} b_{s_1 - v_1} b_{t_2 - u_2} b_{s_2 - v_2} \\
&\quad \times \mathbb{E}[(\mathbf{Z}_{u_1}^\top \Sigma \mathbf{Z}_{v_1} - \delta_{u_1, v_1} \text{tr}(\Sigma))(\mathbf{Z}_{u_2}^\top \Sigma \mathbf{Z}_{v_2} - \delta_{u_2, v_2} \text{tr}(\Sigma))] \\
&= \sum_{\substack{1 \leq t_1, t_2, s_1, s_2 \leq n \\ t_1 \neq s_1, t_2 \neq s_2}} \left\{ \sum_{\substack{t_1 - M \leq r \leq t_1 \wedge (s_1 - M - 1) \\ t_2 - M \leq s \leq t_2 \wedge (s_2 - M - 1), r \neq s}} b_{t_1 - r} b_{s_1 - r} b_{t_2 - s} b_{s_2 - s} \mathbb{E}[(\mathbf{Z}_r^\top \Sigma \mathbf{Z}_r - \text{tr}(\Sigma))(\mathbf{Z}_s^\top \Sigma \mathbf{Z}_s - \text{tr}(\Sigma))] \right. \\
&\quad + \sum_{\substack{(t_1 - M) \wedge (t_2 - M) \leq r \leq t_1 \wedge t_2 \\ s \leq (s_1 - M - 1) \wedge (s_2 - M - 1), r \neq s}} b_{t_1 - r} b_{s_1 - s} b_{t_2 - r} b_{s_2 - s} \mathbb{E}[(\mathbf{Z}_r^\top \Sigma \mathbf{Z}_s)(\mathbf{Z}_r^\top \Sigma \mathbf{Z}_s)] \\
&\quad + \sum_{\substack{t_1 - M \leq r \leq t_1 \wedge (s_2 - M - 1) \\ t_2 - M \leq s \leq t_2 \wedge (s_1 - M - 1), r \neq s}} b_{t_1 - r} b_{s_1 - s} b_{t_2 - s} b_{s_2 - r} \mathbb{E}[(\mathbf{Z}_r^\top \Sigma \mathbf{Z}_s)(\mathbf{Z}_s^\top \Sigma \mathbf{Z}_r)] \\
&\quad \left. + \sum_{\substack{(t_1 - M) \wedge (t_2 - M) \leq r \leq t_1 \wedge t_2 \\ \wedge (s_1 - M - 1) \wedge (s_2 - M - 1)}} b_{t_1 - r} b_{s_1 - r} b_{t_2 - r} b_{s_2 - r} \mathbb{E}[(\mathbf{Z}_r^\top \Sigma \mathbf{Z}_r - \text{tr}(\Sigma))(\mathbf{Z}_r^\top \Sigma \mathbf{Z}_r - \text{tr}(\Sigma))] \right\} \\
&\leq \sum_{\substack{1 \leq t_1, t_2, s_1, s_2 \leq n \\ t_1 \neq s_1, t_2 \neq s_2}} \left\{ \sum_{\substack{(t_1 - M) \wedge (t_2 - M) \leq r \leq t_1 \wedge t_2 \\ s \leq (s_1 - M - 1) \wedge (s_2 - M - 1), r \neq s}} |b_{t_1 - r} b_{t_2 - r}| |b_{s_1 - s} b_{s_2 - s}| \text{tr}(\Sigma^2) \right. \\
&\quad + \sum_{\substack{t_1 - M \leq r \leq t_1 \wedge (s_2 - M - 1) \\ t_2 - M \leq s \leq t_2 \wedge (s_1 - M - 1), r \neq s}} |b_{t_1 - r} b_{s_2 - r}| |b_{s_1 - s} b_{t_2 - s}| \text{tr}(\Sigma^2) \\
&\quad \left. + \sum_{\substack{(t_1 - M) \wedge (t_2 - M) \leq r \leq t_1 \wedge t_2 \wedge (s_1 - M - 1) \wedge (s_2 - M - 1)}} |b_{t_1 - r} b_{t_2 - r} b_{s_1 - r} b_{s_2 - r}| \tau_1 \text{tr}^2(\Sigma) \right\}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\leq \left\{ \left(n \sum_{t_1, t_2 \geq 0} |b_{t_1} b_{t_2}| \right) \left(n \sum_{s_1, s_2 \geq M+1} |b_{s_1} b_{s_2}| \right) + \left(n \sum_{t_1 \geq 0, s_2 \geq M+1} |b_{t_1} b_{s_2}| \right) \left(n \sum_{t_2 \geq 0, s_1 \geq M+1} |b_{s_1} b_{s_2}| \right) \right. \\ \left. + \tau_1 p n \sum_{t_1, t_2 \geq 0} \sum_{s_1, s_2 \geq M+1} |b_{t_1} b_{t_2} b_{s_1} b_{s_2}| \right\} \text{tr}(\Sigma^2) = o(n^2 \text{tr}(\Omega_{n,M}^2)).$$

The last inequality holds due to Lemma B.4. Similarly, we can prove that

$$\text{Var} \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=2}^n \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} (\epsilon_i - \gamma_i)^\top (\epsilon_j - \gamma_j) \right\} = o(n^2 \text{tr}(\Omega_{n,M}^2))$$

This completes the proof. ■

Lemma B.13. *Under Assumptions 1–3 and H_0 holds, as $n \rightarrow \infty$,*

$$\frac{1}{2} \text{tr}(\Omega_{n,M}^2) = \sigma_n^2(1 + o(1)). \quad (19)$$

Proof By some calculations, we have

$$\Omega - \Omega_{n,M} = \left[\left\{ a_0 + 2 \sum_{h=1}^{\infty} a_h \right\} - \left\{ a_{0,M} + 2 \sum_{h=1}^M \left(1 - \frac{h}{n} \right) a_{h,M} \right\} \right] \Sigma.$$

By

$$\left| \left\{ a_0 + 2 \sum_{h=1}^{\infty} a_h \right\} - \left\{ a_{0,M} + 2 \sum_{h=1}^M \left(1 - \frac{h}{n} \right) a_{h,M} \right\} \right| \\ \leq 2 \left| \sum_{h=M+1}^{\infty} \left(1 - \frac{h}{n} \right) \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} b_i b_{i+h} + \sum_{h=0}^M \left(1 - \frac{h}{n} \right) \sum_{i=M-h+1}^{\infty} b_i b_{i+h} + \sum_{h=0}^M \frac{h}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} b_i b_{i+h} \right| \\ \leq 4 \left(\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} |b_i| \right) \left(\sum_{i=M+1}^{\infty} |b_i| \right) + n^{-1} M \sum_{h=0}^M \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} b_i b_{i+h} \\ = o(M^{-4}),$$

We have $\text{tr}\{(\Omega - \Omega_{n,M})^2\} = o(M^{-8}) \text{tr}(\Sigma^2)$ and $\text{tr}\{\Omega_{n,M}(\Omega - \Omega_{n,M})\} = o(M^{-4}) \text{tr}(\Sigma^2)$. Furthermore, by $\text{tr}(\Omega^2) - \text{tr}(\Omega_{n,M}^2) = \text{tr}\{(\Omega - \Omega_{n,M})^2\} + 2 \text{tr}\{\Omega_{n,M}(\Omega - \Omega_{n,M})\}$ and $\text{tr}(\Omega^2) = s^4 \text{tr}(\Sigma^2)$, we have

$$\frac{1}{2} \text{tr}(\Omega_{n,M}^2) = \sigma_n^2(1 + o(1)).$$

■

B.2 Proof of Theorem 2.2

Note that

$$\frac{T_n - \hat{\mu}_n}{\sqrt{\hat{\sigma}_n^2}} = \left(\frac{T_n - \mu_n}{\sqrt{\sigma_n^2}} + \frac{\mu_n - \hat{\mu}_n}{\sqrt{\sigma_n^2}} \right) \cdot \sqrt{\frac{\sigma_n^2}{\hat{\sigma}_n^2}}$$

It is sufficient to prove $(\hat{\mu}_n - \mu_n)/\sqrt{\sigma_n^2} \xrightarrow{P} 0$ and $\hat{\sigma}_n^2/\sigma_n^2 \xrightarrow{P} 1$.

B.2.1 Part 1

Proof In this part, we prove $(\hat{\mu}_n - \mu_n)/\sqrt{\sigma_n^2} \xrightarrow{P} 0$. By the calculations, we have

$$\hat{\mu}_n = \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{h=1}^M \sum_{t=1}^{n-h} (n-h) (\epsilon_t^\top \epsilon_{t+h} - \epsilon_t^\top \bar{\epsilon}_n - \epsilon_{t+h}^\top \bar{\epsilon}_n + \bar{\epsilon}_n^\top \bar{\epsilon}_n).$$

Define

$$\mu_n^* = \sum_{h=1}^M \sum_{t=1}^{n-h} \epsilon_t^\top \epsilon_{t+h} / n,$$

it is equivalent to prove

$$\mu_n^* - \mu_n = o_p(\text{tr}^{1/2}(\Omega_n^2)) \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{\mu}_n - \mu_n^* = o_p(\text{tr}^{1/2}(\Omega_n^2)).$$

$\mathbb{E}(\mu_n^*) = \mu_n$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var}(\mu_n^*) &= \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{h_1=1}^M \sum_{h_2=1}^M \sum_{i_1=1}^{n-h_1} \sum_{i_2=1}^{n-h_2} \mathbb{E}[\{\epsilon_{i_1}^\top \epsilon_{i_1+h_1} - \mathbb{E}(\epsilon_{i_1}^\top \epsilon_{i_1+h_1})\} \{\epsilon_{i_2}^\top \epsilon_{i_2+h_2} - \mathbb{E}(\epsilon_{i_2}^\top \epsilon_{i_2+h_2})\}] \\ &= \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{h_1=1}^M \sum_{h_2=1}^M \sum_{t_1=1}^{n-h_1} \sum_{t_2=1}^{n-h_2} \mathbb{E} \left[\left\{ \sum_{u_1 \leq t_1} \sum_{u_2 \leq i_1+h_1} b_{u_1} b_{u_2} \left(\mathbf{Z}_{i_1-u_1}^\top \Sigma \mathbf{Z}_{i_1+h_1-u_2} - \delta_{i_1-u_1, i_1+h_1-u_2} \text{tr}(\Sigma) \right) \right\} \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left\{ \sum_{u_3 \leq i_2} \sum_{u_4 \leq i_2+h_2} b_{u_3} b_{u_4} \left(\mathbf{Z}_{i_2-u_3}^\top \Sigma \mathbf{Z}_{i_2+h_2-u_4} - \delta_{i_2-u_3, i_2+h_2-u_4} \text{tr}(\Sigma) \right) \right\} \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{h_1=1}^M \sum_{h_2=1}^M \sum_{i_1=1}^{n-h_1} \sum_{i_2=1}^{n-h_2} \sum_{j_1=1}^{i_1} \sum_{j_2=1}^{i_1+h_1} \sum_{j_3=1}^{i_2} \sum_{j_4=1}^{i_2+h_2} b_{i_1-j_1} b_{i_1+h_1-j_2} b_{i_2-j_3} b_{i_2+h_2-j_4} \\ &\quad \mathbb{E} \left[\left\{ \mathbf{Z}_{j_1}^\top \Sigma \mathbf{Z}_{j_2} - \delta_{j_1, j_2} \text{tr}(\Sigma) \right\} \left\{ \mathbf{Z}_{j_3}^\top \Sigma \mathbf{Z}_{j_4} - \delta_{j_3, j_4} \text{tr}(\Sigma) \right\} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Consider the value of $\rho(j_1, j_2, j_3, j_4) \triangleq \mathbb{E}[(\mathbf{Z}_{j_1}^\top \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \mathbf{Z}_{j_2} - \delta_{j_1, j_2} \text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}))(\mathbf{Z}_{j_3}^\top \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \mathbf{Z}_{j_4} - \delta_{j_3, j_4} \text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}))]$.

$$\rho(j_1, j_2, j_3, j_4) \begin{cases} = \text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^2), & j_1 = j_3 = r, j_2 = j_4 = s, r \neq s \\ = \text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^2), & j_1 = j_4 = r, j_2 = j_3 = s, r \neq s \\ \leq \tau_1 \text{tr}^2(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}), & j_1 = j_2 = j_3 = j_4 = r \\ = 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

So, we need to consider the coefficient

$$C_{j_1, j_2, j_3, j_4} \triangleq \sum_{j_1=1}^{i_1} \sum_{j_2=1}^{i_1+h_1} \sum_{j_3=1}^{i_2} \sum_{j_4=1}^{i_2+h_2} b_{i_1-j_1} b_{i_1+h_1-j_2} b_{i_2-j_3} b_{i_2+h_2-j_4}.$$

Then,

$$\sum_{i_1=1}^{n-h_1} \sum_{i_2=1}^{n-h_2} |C_{r,s,r,s}| \leq \sum_{i_1=1}^{n-h_1} \sum_{i_2=1}^{n-h_2} \sum_{r=1}^{i_1 \wedge i_2} \sum_{s=1}^{(i_1+h_1) \wedge (i_2+h_2)} |b_{i_1-r} b_{i_1+h_1-s} b_{i_2-r} b_{i_2+h_2-s}|$$

Consider the number of $|b_{k_1} b_{k_2} b_{k_3} b_{k_4}|$ appear in the right hand side. This can be equivalently written as

$$i_1 - r = k_1 \quad i_1 + h_1 - s = k_2 \quad i_2 - r = k_3 \quad i_2 + h_2 - s = k_4.$$

Fix i_1 and k_1, k_2, k_3, k_4 , (r, s, i_2) can be uniquely represented by $(i_1, k_1, k_2, k_3, k_4)$, or not exist. Therefore, $|b_{k_1} b_{k_2} b_{k_3} b_{k_4}|$ appears at most $n - h_1$ times. We can conclude that

$$\sum_{r \leq n-h_1} \sum_{s \leq n-h_2} |C_{r,s,r,s}| \leq n \left(\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} |b_i| \right)^4$$

Similarly, we can prove that

$$\sum_{r \leq n-h_1} \sum_{s \leq n-h_2} |C_{r,s,s,r}| \leq n \left(\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} |b_i| \right)^4 \quad \sum_{r \leq n-h_1 \wedge h_2} |C_{r,r,r,r}| \leq \left(\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} |b_i| \right)^4$$

By $\text{tr}^2(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}) \leq p \text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^2)$, we have

$$\text{var}(\mu_n^*) = O(M^2(n^{-1} + n^{-2}p) \text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^2)).$$

Thus, $\mu_n^* - \mu'_n = o_p(\text{tr}^{1/2}(\boldsymbol{\Omega}_n^2))$. Now, we only need to prove $\hat{\mu}_n - \mu_n^* = o_p(\text{tr}^{1/2}(\boldsymbol{\Omega}_n^2))$.

We mainly focus on proving

$$\frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{h=1}^M \sum_{t=1}^{n-h} (n-h) \left\{ \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_t^\top \bar{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}_n + \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{t+h}^\top \bar{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}_n - \bar{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}_n^\top \bar{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}_n \right\} = o_p(\text{tr}^{1/2}(\boldsymbol{\Omega}_n^2)).$$

Since $\sum_{t_1=1}^{n-h_1} \sum_{t_2=1}^{n-h_2} \sum_{j=1}^{t_1 \wedge t_2} |b_{t_1-j} b_{t_2-j}| \leq n(\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} |b_i|)^2$, under Assumptions (A1)–(A3) and $M = \lceil \min(n, p)^{1/8} \rceil$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left\{ \frac{1}{n^4} \sum_{h_1=1}^M \sum_{t_1=1}^{n-h_1} \sum_{h_2=1}^M \sum_{t_2=1}^{n-h_2} (n-h_1)(n-h_2) \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{t_1}^\top \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{t_2} \right\} \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left\{ \frac{1}{n^4} \sum_{h_1=1}^M \sum_{t_1=1}^{n-h_1} \sum_{h_2=1}^M \sum_{t_2=1}^{n-h_2} \sum_{j_1=1}^{t_1} \sum_{j_2=1}^{t_2} (n-h_1)(n-h_2) b_{t_1-j_1} b_{t_2-j_2} Z_{j_1}^\top \Sigma Z_{j_2} \right\} \\
&= \frac{1}{n^4} \sum_{h_1=1}^M \sum_{h_2=1}^M (n-h_1)(n-h_2) \sum_{t_1=1}^{n-h_1} \sum_{t_2=1}^{n-h_2} \sum_{j=1}^{t_1 \wedge t_2} b_{t_1-j} b_{t_2-j} \text{tr}(\Sigma), \\
&= O(n^{-1} p^{1/2} M^2 \text{tr}^{1/2}(\mathbf{\Omega}_n^2)) = o(\text{tr}^{1/2}(\mathbf{\Omega}_n^2)),
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\mathbb{E}(\bar{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}_n^\top \bar{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}_n) = \frac{1}{n} \text{tr}(\mathbf{\Omega}_n) \leq \frac{\sqrt{p}}{n} \text{tr}^{1/2}(\mathbf{\Omega}_n^2) = o(\text{tr}^{1/2}(\mathbf{\Omega}_n^2)).$$

These implies $\hat{\mu}_n - \mu'_n = o_p(\text{tr}^{1/2}(\mathbf{\Omega}_n^2))$.

B.2.2 Part 2

In this part, we prove $\hat{\sigma}_n^2 / \sigma_n^2 \xrightarrow{P} 1$. Define $\hat{\sigma}_n^2 = \hat{\sigma}_{n,1}^2 + \hat{\sigma}_{n,2}^2$, where

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{\sigma}_{n,1}^2 &= \frac{1}{2} \left(S_{0,0,1} + 2 \sum_{r=1}^M S_{r,0,1} + 2 \sum_{r=1}^M S_{0,r,1} + 4 \sum_{r=1}^M \sum_{s=1}^M S_{r,s,1} \right), \\
\hat{\sigma}_{n,2}^2 &= \frac{1}{2} \left(S_{0,0,2} + 2 \sum_{r=1}^M S_{r,0,2} + 2 \sum_{r=1}^M S_{0,r,2} + 4 \sum_{r=1}^M \sum_{s=1}^M S_{r,s,2} \right), \\
&\quad \sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor - s} \sum_{j=i+\lfloor n/2 \rfloor}^{n-s} \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_j \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{i+r}^\top \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{j+s} \\
S_{r,s,1} &= \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor - s} \sum_{j=i+\lfloor n/2 \rfloor}^{n-s} \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_j \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{i+r}^\top \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{j+s}}{(n-s/2 - \frac{3}{2}\lfloor n/2 \rfloor + 1/2)(\lfloor n/2 \rfloor - s)}, \quad S_{r,s,2} = S_{r,s} - S_{r,s,1}.
\end{aligned}$$

We will prove $\hat{\sigma}_{n,1}^2 / \sigma_n^2 \xrightarrow{P} 1$ and $\hat{\sigma}_{n,2}^2 / \sigma_n^2 \xrightarrow{P} 0$.

Step 1. In this step, we prove $\hat{\sigma}_{n,1}^2 / \sigma_n^2 \xrightarrow{P} 1$. It suffice to prove $(S_{r,s,1} - a_r a_s \text{tr}(\Sigma^2)) / \text{tr}(\Sigma^2) = o_p(1)$, which implies that

$$\frac{S_{0,0,1} + 2 \sum_{r=1}^M S_{r,0,1} + 2 \sum_{r=1}^M S_{0,r,1} + 4 \sum_{r=1}^M \sum_{s=1}^M S_{r,s,1}}{(a_0^2 + 4 \sum_{r=1}^M a_0 a_r + 4 \sum_{r=1}^M \sum_{s=1}^M a_r a_s) \text{tr}(\Sigma^2)} = 1 + o(1).$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
& (n - s/2 - \frac{3}{2}[n/2] + 1/2)([n/2] - s)\mathbb{E}(S_{r,s,1} - a_r a_s \text{tr}(\Sigma^2)) \\
&= \sum_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq [n/2] - s \\ i + [n/2] \leq j \leq n - s}} \left\{ \sum_{\substack{\ell_1 \leq i, \ell_2 \leq j \\ \ell_3 \leq i+r, \ell_4 \leq j+s}} b_{i-\ell_1} b_{j-\ell_2} b_{i+r-\ell_3} b_{j+s-\ell_4} \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{Z}_{\ell_1}^\top \Sigma \mathbf{Z}_{\ell_2} \mathbf{Z}_{\ell_3}^\top \Sigma \mathbf{Z}_{\ell_4}) - a_r a_s \text{tr}(\Sigma^2) \right\} \\
&\leq \sum_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq [n/2] - s \\ i + [n/2] \leq j \leq n - s}} \left\{ \left(\sum_{\ell_1 \leq i, \ell_2 \leq j} b_{i-\ell_1} b_{j-\ell_2} b_{i+r-\ell_1} b_{j+s-\ell_2} + \sum_{\substack{\ell_1 \leq i \wedge (j+s) \\ \ell_2 \leq j \wedge (i+r)}} b_{i-\ell_1} b_{j-\ell_2} b_{i+r-\ell_2} b_{j+s-\ell_1} \right) \text{tr}(\Sigma^2) \right. \\
&\quad + \sum_{\substack{\ell_1 \leq i \wedge j \\ \ell_2 \leq (i+r) \wedge (j+s)}} b_{i-\ell_1} b_{j-\ell_1} b_{i+r-\ell_2} b_{j+s-\ell_2} \text{tr}^2(\Sigma) + Cp \sum_{\ell \leq i \wedge j} b_{i-\ell} b_{j-\ell} b_{i+r-\ell} b_{j+s-\ell} a_r a_s \text{tr}(\Sigma^2) \\
&\quad \left. - a_r a_s \text{tr}(\Sigma^2) \right\} \\
&= O \left[\sum_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq [n/2] - s \\ i + [n/2] \leq j \leq n - s}} \left\{ \left(a_{j+s-i} a_{i+r-j} + p a_{j-i} a_{j+s-i-r} + p \sum_{\ell \leq i \wedge j} b_{i-\ell} b_{j-\ell} b_{i+r-\ell} b_{j+s-\ell} a_r a_s \right) \text{tr}(\Sigma^2) \right\} \right] \\
&= o(n^{-1} p \text{tr}(\Sigma^2)).
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, $\mathbb{E}\{(S_{r,s,1} - a_r a_s \text{tr}(\Sigma^2))/\text{tr}(\Sigma^2)\} = o(n^{-3}p) = o(1)$. Similarly, we can verify that $\text{var}\{(S_{r,s,1} - a_r a_s \text{tr}(\Sigma^2))/\text{tr}(\Sigma^2)\} = o(pn^{-2} + n^{-1}) = o(1)$. Thus, $(S_{r,s,1} - a_r a_s \text{tr}(\Sigma^2))/\text{tr}(\Sigma^2) = o_p(1)$. It follows that,

$$\frac{S_{0,0,1} + 2 \sum_{r=1}^M S_{r,0,1} + 2 \sum_{r=1}^M S_{0,r,1} + 4 \sum_{r=1}^M \sum_{s=1}^M S_{r,s,1}}{(a_0^2 + 4 \sum_{r=1}^M a_o a_r + 4 \sum_{r=1}^M \sum_{s=1}^M a_r a_s) \text{tr}(\Sigma^2)} = 1 + o_p(1).$$

Now, we get $\hat{\sigma}_{n,1}^2/\sigma_n^2 \xrightarrow{P} 1$.

Step 2. In this step, we will prove $\hat{\sigma}_{n,2}^2/\sigma_n^2 \xrightarrow{P} 0$. It suffices to prove that $\sum_{r=1}^M \sum_{s=1}^M S_{r,s,2}/\text{tr}(\Sigma^2) = o_p(1)$.

$$\begin{aligned}
& (\mathbf{X}_i - \bar{\mathbf{X}}_n)^\top (\mathbf{X}_j - \bar{\mathbf{X}}_n) (\mathbf{X}_{i+r} - \bar{\mathbf{X}}_n)^\top (\mathbf{X}_{j+s} - \bar{\mathbf{X}}_n) \\
&= (\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_i - \bar{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}_n)^\top (\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_j - \bar{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}_n) (\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{i+r} - \bar{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}_n)^\top (\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{j+s} - \bar{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}_n) \\
&= (\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_j - \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_i^\top \bar{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}_n - \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_j^\top \bar{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}_n + \bar{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}_n^\top \bar{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}_n) (\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{i+r}^\top \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{j+s} - \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{i+r}^\top \bar{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}_n - \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{j+s}^\top \bar{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}_n + \bar{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}_n^\top \bar{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}_n)
\end{aligned}$$

We first verify that

$$\sum_{r=1}^M \sum_{s=1}^M \frac{\sum_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq [n/2]-s \\ i+[n/2] \leq j \leq n-s}} \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_j \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{i+r}^\top \bar{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}_n}{(n-s/2 - \frac{3}{2}[n/2] + 1/2)([n/2] - s)} = o_p(\text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^2)).$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\substack{1 \leq i_1 \leq [n/2]-s \\ i_1+[n/2] \leq j_1 \leq n-s}} \sum_{\substack{1 \leq i_2 \leq [n/2]-s \\ i_2+[n/2] \leq j_2 \leq n-s}} \mathbb{E}(\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{i_1}^\top \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{j_1} \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{i_1+r}^\top \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{i_2}^\top \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{j_2} \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{i_2+r}^\top) \\ = & \sum_{\substack{1 \leq i_1 \leq [n/2]-s \\ i_1+[n/2] \leq j_1 \leq n-s}} \sum_{\substack{1 \leq i_2 \leq [n/2]-s \\ i_2+[n/2] \leq j_2 \leq n-s}} \left\{ \sum_{\substack{\ell_1 \leq i_1, \ell_2 \leq j_1 \\ \ell_3 \leq i_1+r}} \sum_{\substack{\ell_4 \leq i_2, \ell_5 \leq j_2 \\ \ell_6 \leq i_2+r}} b_{i_1-\ell_1} b_{j_1-\ell_2} b_{i_1+r-\ell_3} b_{i_2-\ell_4} b_{j_2-\ell_5} b_{i_2+r-\ell_6} \right. \\ & \left. \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{Z}_{\ell_1}^\top \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \mathbf{Z}_{\ell_2} \mathbf{Z}_{\ell_3}^\top \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \mathbf{Z}_{\ell_4} \mathbf{Z}_{\ell_5}^\top \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \mathbf{Z}_{\ell_6}) \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Define $\rho(\ell_1, \ell_2, \ell_3, \ell_4, \ell_5, \ell_6) = \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{Z}_{\ell_1}^\top \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \mathbf{Z}_{\ell_2} \mathbf{Z}_{\ell_3}^\top \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \mathbf{Z}_{\ell_4} \mathbf{Z}_{\ell_5}^\top \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \mathbf{Z}_{\ell_6})$,

$$\rho(\ell_1, \ell_2, \ell_3, \ell_4, \ell_5, \ell_6) \begin{cases} = \text{tr}^3(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}), & \ell_1 = \ell_2 = a, \ell_3 = \ell_4 = b, \ell_5 = \ell_6 = c, a \neq b \neq c \\ = \text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}) \text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^2), & \ell_1 = \ell_3 = a, \ell_2 = \ell_4 = b, \ell_5 = \ell_6 = s, a \neq b \neq c \\ \leq \tau_1 \text{tr}^3(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}), & \ell_1 = \ell_2 = a, \ell_3 = \ell_4 = \ell_5 = \ell_6 = b, a \neq b \\ \leq \tau_2 \text{tr}^3(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}), & \ell_1 = \ell_2 = \ell_3 = \ell_4 = \ell_5 = \ell_6 = a \\ = 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Now, we consider the coefficient

$$C_{\ell_1, \ell_2, \ell_3, \ell_4, \ell_5, \ell_6} \triangleq \sum_{\substack{\ell_1 \leq i_1, \ell_2 \leq j_1 \\ \ell_3 \leq i_1+r}} \sum_{\substack{\ell_4 \leq i_2, \ell_5 \leq j_2 \\ \ell_6 \leq i_2+r}} b_{i_1-\ell_1} b_{j_1-\ell_2} b_{i_1+r-\ell_3} b_{i_2-\ell_4} b_{j_2-\ell_5} b_{i_2+r-\ell_6}.$$

Similar to the discussion in the proof of proposition 2, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\substack{1 \leq i_1 \leq [n/2]-s \\ i_1+[n/2] \leq j_1 \leq n-s}} \sum_{\substack{1 \leq i_2 \leq [n/2]-s \\ i_2+[n/2] \leq j_2 \leq n-s}} C_{a, a, b, b, c, c} \\ \leq & \sum_{\substack{1 \leq i_1 \leq [n/2]-s \\ i_1+[n/2] \leq j_1 \leq n-s}} \sum_{\substack{1 \leq i_2 \leq [n/2]-s \\ i_2+[n/2] \leq j_2 \leq n-s}} \sum_{\substack{a \leq i_1 \wedge j_1, b \leq (i_1+r) \wedge i_2 \\ c \leq j_2 \wedge (i_2+r)}} |b_{i_1-a} b_{j_1-a} b_{i_1+r-b} b_{i_2-b} b_{j_2-c} b_{i_2+r-c}| \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq n \left(\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} |b_i| \right)^6 \\
&\quad \sum_{\substack{1 \leq i_1 \leq [n/2]-s \\ i_1 + [n/2] \leq j_1 \leq n-s}} \sum_{\substack{1 \leq i_2 \leq [n/2]-s \\ i_2 + [n/2] \leq j_2 \leq n-s}} C_{a,b,a,b,c,c}, \\
&\leq \sum_{\substack{1 \leq i_1 \leq [n/2]-s \\ i_1 + [n/2] \leq j_1 \leq n-s}} \sum_{\substack{1 \leq i_2 \leq [n/2]-s \\ i_2 + [n/2] \leq j_2 \leq n-s}} \sum_{\substack{a \leq i_1, b \leq j_1 \wedge i_2 \\ c \leq j_2 \wedge (i_2+r)}} |b_{i_1-a} b_{j_1-b} b_{i_1+r-a} b_{i_2-b} b_{j_2-c} b_{i_2+r-c}| \\
&\leq n^2 \left(\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} |b_i| \right)^6
\end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, we have

$$\sum_{\substack{1 \leq i_1 \leq [n/2]-s \\ i_1 + [n/2] \leq j_1 \leq n-s}} \sum_{\substack{1 \leq i_2 \leq [n/2]-s \\ i_2 + [n/2] \leq j_2 \leq n-s}} C_{a,a,a,a,b,b} \leq \left(\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} |b_i| \right)^6, \quad \sum_{\substack{1 \leq i_1 \leq [n/2]-s \\ i_1 + [n/2] \leq j_1 \leq n-s}} \sum_{\substack{1 \leq i_2 \leq [n/2]-s \\ i_2 + [n/2] \leq j_2 \leq n-s}} C_{a,a,a,a,a,a} \leq \left(\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} |b_i| \right)^6$$

As $\text{tr}(\mathbf{\Sigma}) \leq \sqrt{p} \text{tr}^{1/2}(\mathbf{\Sigma}^2)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{\substack{1 \leq i_1 \leq [n/2]-s \\ i_1 + [n/2] \leq j_1 \leq n-s}} \sum_{\substack{1 \leq i_2 \leq [n/2]-s \\ i_2 + [n/2] \leq j_2 \leq n-s}} \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{\epsilon}_{i_1}^\top \mathbf{\epsilon}_{j_1} \mathbf{\epsilon}_{i_1+r}^\top \mathbf{\epsilon}_{i_2}^\top \mathbf{\epsilon}_{j_2} \mathbf{\epsilon}_{i_2+r}^\top) &= O(n \text{tr}^3(\mathbf{\Sigma}) + n^2 \text{tr}(\mathbf{\Sigma}) \text{tr}(\mathbf{\Sigma}^2) + \text{tr}^3(\mathbf{\Sigma})) \\
&= O(np^{3/2} + n^2 p^{1/2}) \text{tr}^{3/2}(\mathbf{\Sigma}^2).
\end{aligned}$$

Since $\mathbb{E}(\bar{\mathbf{\epsilon}}_n^\top \bar{\mathbf{\epsilon}}_n) = O(n^{-1} p^{1/2} \text{tr}^{1/2}(\mathbf{\Sigma}^2))$, These implies

$$\sum_{r=1}^M \sum_{s=1}^M \frac{\sum_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq [n/2]-s \\ i + [n/2] \leq j \leq n-s}} \mathbf{\epsilon}_i^\top \mathbf{\epsilon}_j \mathbf{\epsilon}_{i+r}^\top \bar{\mathbf{\epsilon}}_n}{(n - s/2 - \frac{3}{2}[n/2] + 1/2)([n/2] - s)} = O_p(n^{-4} p M^2 \text{tr}(\mathbf{\Sigma}^2)) = o_p(\text{tr}(\mathbf{\Sigma}^2)).$$

Similarly, we can verify

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{r=1}^M \sum_{s=1}^M \frac{\sum_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq [n/2]-s \\ i + [n/2] \leq j \leq n-s}} \mathbf{\epsilon}_i^\top \mathbf{\epsilon}_j \bar{\mathbf{\epsilon}}_n^\top \bar{\mathbf{\epsilon}}_n}{(n - s/2 - \frac{3}{2}[n/2] + 1/2)([n/2] - s)} &= O_p((n^{-3/2} p^{1/2} + n^{-2} p) M \text{tr}(\mathbf{\Sigma}^2)) = o_p(\text{tr}(\mathbf{\Sigma}^2)), \\
\sum_{r=1}^M \sum_{s=1}^M \frac{\sum_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq [n/2]-s \\ i + [n/2] \leq j \leq n-s}} \mathbf{\epsilon}_i^\top \bar{\mathbf{\epsilon}}_n \bar{\mathbf{\epsilon}}_n^\top \bar{\mathbf{\epsilon}}_n}{(n - s/2 - \frac{3}{2}[n/2] + 1/2)([n/2] - s)} &= O_p(n^{-2} p M^2 \text{tr}(\mathbf{\Sigma}^2)) = o_p(\text{tr}(\mathbf{\Sigma}^2)),
\end{aligned}$$

$$\sum_{r=1}^M \sum_{s=1}^M \frac{\sum_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq [n/2]-s \\ i+[n/2] \leq j \leq n-s}} \bar{\epsilon}_n^\top \bar{\epsilon}_n \bar{\epsilon}_n^\top \bar{\epsilon}_n}{(n - s/2 - \frac{3}{2}[n/2] + 1/2)([n/2] - s)} = O_p(n^{-2} p M^2 \text{tr}(\Sigma^2)) = o_p(\text{tr}(\Sigma^2)).$$

■